

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

83^d CONGRESS
2^d SESSION

H. R. 7678

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 2, 1954

Mr. WATTS introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Public Works

A BILL

To amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That (a) for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of
4 the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39
5 Stat. 355), and all laws amendatory thereof and supple-
6 mentary thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appro-
7 priated the sum of \$650,000,000 for the fiscal year ending
8 June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending
9 June 30, 1957. The sum authorized by this subsection for

1 each such fiscal year shall be available for expenditure as
2 follows:

3 (1) \$292,500,000 for projects on the Federal-aid
4 primary highway system;

5 (2) \$195,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid
6 secondary highway system; and

7 (3) \$162,500,000 for projects on the Federal-aid
8 primary highway system in urban areas.

9 (b) For the purpose of expediting the construction,
10 reconstruction, and improvement, inclusive of necessary
11 bridges and tunnels, of the National System of Interstate
12 Highways, designated in accordance with the provisions of
13 section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved
14 December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838), there is hereby author-
15 ized to be appropriated the additional sum of \$150,000,000
16 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like addi-
17 tional sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957. The
18 Federal share payable on account of any project provided for
19 by funds made available and apportioned each year to each
20 State for the National System of Interstate Highways shall
21 not exceed 75 per centum of the cost of construction and of
22 rights-of-way in connection with such project.

23 (c) The sums authorized by subsections (a) and (b)
24 of this section for each fiscal year, respectively, shall be
25 apportioned among the several States in the manner now

1 provided by law and in accordance with the formulas set
2 forth in section 4 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944,
3 approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838).

4 (d) Upon the request of the highway department of a
5 State, any one or more of the amounts authorized by sub-
6 sections (a) and (b) of this section and apportioned to such
7 State in any year for expenditure on any Federal-aid primary
8 highway system, the Federal-aid secondary highway system,
9 or the National System of Interstate Highways, as provided
10 for by this section, may be increased by not to exceed 20
11 per centum through transfer of funds from any one or more of
12 the other amounts so authorized by such subsection (a) and
13 (b) and apportioned to such State in such year, if the State
14 highway department has certified that such transfer of funds
15 would be in the public interest and the Secretary of Com-
16 merce has approved such transfer.

17 (e) Any sums apportioned to a State under the pro-
18 visions of this section shall be available for expenditure in
19 such State for two years after the close of the fiscal year
20 for which such sums are authorized and any amount so
21 apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period
22 shall lapse. Such funds for any fiscal year shall be deemed
23 to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the
24 sums apportioned to such State for such fiscal year is covered
25 by formal agreements with the Commissioner of Public

1 Roads for the improvement of specific projects as provided
2 by this Act.

3 SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions
4 of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218),
5 as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized to
6 be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of \$24,-
7 000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a
8 like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and (2)
9 for forest-development roads and trails the sum of \$24,000,-
10 000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like
11 sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957: *Provided*,
12 That with respect to any proposed construction or recon-
13 struction of a timber access road, advisory public hearings
14 shall be held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area
15 of construction or reconstruction with notice and reasonable
16 opportunity for interested persons to present their views
17 as to the practicability and feasibility of such construction
18 or reconstruction: *And provided further*, That the appro-
19 priation herein authorized for forest highways shall be ap-
20 portioned by the Commissioner of Public Roads for expendi-
21 ture in the several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico in
22 accordance with the provision of section 3 of the Federal-
23 Aid Highway Act of 1950.

24 SEC. 3. (a) For the construction, reconstruction, im-
25 provement, and maintenance of roads and trails, exclusive

1 of necessary bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other
2 areas administered by the National Park Service, including
3 areas authorized to be established as national parks and
4 monuments, and national park and monument approach roads
5 authorized by the Act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat. 1053),
6 as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated
7 the sum of \$11,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,
8 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30,
9 1957.

10 (b) For the construction, reconstruction, improvement,
11 and maintenance of parkways, authorized by Acts of Con-
12 gress, on lands to which title is vested in the United States,
13 there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of
14 \$11,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956,
15 and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

16 (c) For the construction, improvement, and mainte-
17 nance of Indian reservation roads and bridges and roads and
18 bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian
19 lands under the provisions of the Act approved May 26, 1928
20 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be appro-
21 priated the sum of \$11,000,000 for the fiscal year ending
22 June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending
23 June 30, 1957: *Provided*, That the location, type, and
24 design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be ap-

1 proved by the Commissioner of Public Roads before any
2 expenditures are made thereon, and all such construction shall
3 be under the general supervision of the Commissioner of
4 Public Roads.

5 SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized an emergency fund
6 in the amount of \$11,000,000 for expenditure by the Com-
7 missioner of Public Roads, in accordance with the provisions
8 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act, as amended and supple-
9 mented, after receipt of an application therefor from the
10 highway department of any State, in the repair or recon-
11 struction of highways and bridges on the Federal-aid high-
12 way systems, which he shall find have suffered serious dam-
13 age as the result of disaster over a wide area, such as by
14 floods, hurricanes, tidal waves, earthquakes, severe storms,
15 landslides, or other catastrophes in any part of the United
16 States. The appropriation of such moneys as may be nec-
17 essary for the initial establishment of this fund and for its
18 replenishment on an annual basis is hereby authorized:
19 *Provided*, That, pending the appropriation of said sum, or its
20 replenishment, the Commissioner of Public Roads may
21 expend, from existing Federal-aid highway appropriations,
22 such sums as may be necessary for the immediate prosecu-
23 tion of the work herein authorized, such appropriations to
24 be reimbursed from the appropriation herein authorized
25 when made: *Provided further*, That no expenditures shall

1 be made hereunder with respect to any such catastrophe in
2 any State unless an emergency has been declared by the
3 Governor of such State, and concurred in by the Commis-
4 sioner of Public Roads: *And provided further*, That the
5 Federal share payable on account of any repair or recon-
6 struction project provided for by funds made available under
7 this section shall not exceed 50 per centum of the cost
8 thereof, except that on the National System of Interstate
9 Highways the Federal share shall not exceed 75 per centum
10 of the cost.

11 SEC. 5. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions
12 of section 10 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64
13 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated
14 for the survey, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance
15 of main roads through unappropriated or unreserved public
16 lands, nontaxable Indian lands, or other Federal reserva-
17 tions, the sum of \$2,750,000 for the fiscal year ending June
18 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30,
19 1957, to remain available until expended.

20 SEC. 6. The Commissioner of Public Roads is author-
21 ized and directed to assist in carrying out the action pro-
22 gram of the President's Highway Safety Conference and to
23 cooperate with the State highway departments and other
24 agencies in this program to advance the cause of safety on
25 the streets and highways: *Provided*, That not to exceed

1 \$200,000 shall be expended annually for the purposes of
2 this section.

3 SEC. 7. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions
4 of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat.
5 765), as amended, and section 12 of the Federal-Aid High-
6 way Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), as amended, there is
7 hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of
8 \$50,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*,
9 That whenever any project for the construction or improve-
10 ment of a circumferential highway around a city or of a radial
11 intracity route thereto submitted by any State, is certified
12 by the Secretary of Defense, or such other official as the
13 President may designate, as being important for civilian or
14 military defense, such project may be constructed under the
15 authorization in this section and in accordance with the con-
16 ditions contained therein: *And provided further*, That with
17 respect to any proposed construction or reconstruction of a
18 timber access road under the authority contained in this sec-
19 tion, advisory public hearings shall be held at a place
20 convenient or adjacent to the area of construction or recon-
21 struction with notice and reasonable opportunity for in-
22 terested persons to present their views as to the practicability
23 and feasibility of such construction or reconstruction.

24 SEC. 8. All provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act
25 of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838); the

1 Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, approved June 29, 1948
2 (62 Stat. 1105) ; the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950,
3 approved September 7, 1950; and the Federal-Aid Highway
4 Act of 1952, approved June 25, 1952, not inconsistent with
5 this Act, shall remain in full force and effect.

6 SEC. 9. If any section, subsection, or other provision of
7 this Act or the application thereof to any person or circum-
8 stance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act and the ap-
9 plication of such section, subsection, or other provision to
10 other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

11 SEC. 10. All laws or parts of laws in any way incon-
12 sistent with the provisions of this Act are hereby repealed,
13 and this Act shall take effect on its passage.

14 SEC. 11. This Act may be cited as the "Federal-Aid
15 Highway Act of 1954".

A BILL

To amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

By Mr. WATTS

FEBRUARY 2, 1954

Referred to the Committee on Public Works

83^D CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 7818

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 9, 1954

Mr. MCGREGOR introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Public Works

A BILL

To amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the
4 Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat.
5 355), and all Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary
6 thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the
7 sum of \$600,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,
8 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30,
9 1957.

1 SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of expediting the construc-
2 tion, reconstruction, and improvement, inclusive of necessary
3 bridges and tunnels, of the national system of interstate high-
4 ways, designated in accordance with the provisions of section
5 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838),
6 there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional
7 sum of \$200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,
8 1956, and a like additional sum for the fiscal year ending
9 June 30, 1957. The sum herein authorized for each fiscal
10 year shall be apportioned among the several States in the
11 following manner: one-half in the ratio which the popula-
12 tion of each State bears to the total population of all the
13 States, as shown by the latest available Federal census:
14 *Provided*, That no State shall receive less than three-fourths
15 of 1 per centum of the money so apportioned; and one-half
16 in the manner now provided by law for apportionment of
17 funds for the Federal-Aid primary system: *Provided further*,
18 That the Federal share payable on account of any project
19 provided for by funds made available under the provisions of
20 this section shall be determined in the same manner as now
21 provided by law for projects on the Federal-aid primary sys-
22 tem: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Commerce shall
23 not apportion to the States the sum authorized by this section
24 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, unless a Federal
25 excise tax on gasoline in the amount of not less than 2 cents

1 per gallon is in effect on December 31, 1954; and the Sec-
2 retary of Commerce shall not apportion to the States the sum
3 authorized by this section for the fiscal year ending June 30,
4 1957, unless a Federal excise tax on gasoline in the amount
5 of not less than 2 cents per gallon is in effect on December
6 31, 1955.

7 (b) Any sums apportioned to any State under the pro-
8 visions of this section shall be available for expenditure in
9 that State for six months after the close of fiscal year for
10 which such sums are authorized: *Provided*, That such funds
11 for any fiscal year shall be deemed to be expended in such
12 amounts, and at such times as the Secretary of Commerce
13 shall determine that the recipient State has actually incurred
14 contractual obligations thereunder for the performance of
15 specific projects.

16 (c) Any amount apportioned to the States under the
17 provisions of this section unexpended at the end of the
18 period during which it is available for expenditure under
19 the terms of subsection (b) of this section shall be re-
20 apportioned within sixty days thereafter to all the States
21 on the same basis as if it were being apportioned under this
22 section for the first time.

23 SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions
24 of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218),

1 as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized
2 to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of
3 \$22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and
4 a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957: *Pro-*
5 *vided*, That any sums heretofore authorized unobligated on
6 June 30, 1955, shall be canceled as of June 30, 1955;
7 and (2) for forest development roads and trails the sum of
8 \$22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a
9 like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957: *Provided*,
10 That with respect to any proposed construction or recon-
11 struction of a timber access road, advisory public hearings
12 shall be held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area
13 of construction or reconstruction with notice and reasonable
14 opportunity for interested persons to present their views
15 as to the practicability and feasibility of such construction
16 or reconstruction: *Provided further*, That the appropriation
17 herein authorized for forest highways shall be apportioned
18 by the Secretary of Commerce for expenditure in the sev-
19 eral States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico in accordance with the
20 provision of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act
21 of 1950.

22 SEC. 4. (a) For the construction, reconstruction, and
23 improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary
24 bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas ad-

1 ministered by the National Park Service, including areas
2 authorized to be established as national parks and monuments,
3 and national park and monument approach roads authorized
4 by the Act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat. 1053), as
5 amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the
6 sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,
7 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30,
8 1957.

9 (b) For the construction, reconstruction, improvement,
10 and maintenance of parkways, authorized by Acts of Con-
11 gress, on lands to which title is vested in the United States,
12 there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of
13 \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and
14 a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

15 (c) For the construction, improvement, and mainte-
16 nance of Indian reservation roads and bridges and roads and
17 bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian
18 lands under the provisions of the Act approved May 26,
19 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be
20 appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year
21 ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year
22 ending June 30, 1957: *Provided*, That the location, type,
23 and design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be
24 approved by the Secretary of Commerce before any expendi-

1 tures are made thereon, and all such construction shall be
2 under the general supervision of the Secretary of Commerce.

3 SEC. 5. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of
4 section 5 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 (66 Stat.
5 158), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the
6 Department of State, in addition to the sums heretofore
7 authorized, such sums not in excess of \$4,000,000, to be
8 available until expended, as are necessary to complete the
9 United States obligation under the applicable agreement with
10 the Republic of Nicaragua: *Provided*, That the survey and
11 construction work authorized by the said section 5 shall be
12 under the general supervision of the Secretary of Commerce.

13 SEC. 6. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of
14 section 1 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for coop-
15 eration with Central American Republics in the construction
16 of the Inter-American Highway" approved December 26,
17 1941 (55 Stat. 860), as amended by section 11 of the
18 Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7,
19 1950 (64 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized to be
20 appropriated to the Department of State in addition to the
21 sums heretofore authorized, the sum of \$8,000,000 for the
22 fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and a like sum for the
23 fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, to be available until ex-
24 pended, to enable the United States to cooperate with the
25 Governments of the American Republics situated in Central

1 America—that is, with the Governments of the Republics of
2 Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua,
3 and Panama—in the survey and construction of the Inter-
4 American Highway within the borders of the aforesaid
5 Republics, respectively. Not to exceed one-third of the
6 appropriation authorized for each fiscal year may be expended
7 without requiring the country or countries in which such
8 sums may be expended to match any part thereof, if the
9 Secretary of State shall find that the cost of constructing
10 said highway in such country or countries will be beyond
11 their reasonable capacity to bear.

12 SEC. 7. All provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act
13 of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838) ; the
14 Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, approved June 29, 1948
15 (62 Stat. 1105) ; and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950,
16 approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785) ; and the
17 Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952, approved June 25, 1952
18 (66 Stat. 158) , not inconsistent with this Act, shall remain
19 in full force and effect.

20 SEC. 8. If any section, subsection, or other provision of
21 this Act or the application thereof to any person or circum-
22 stance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act and the
23 application of such section, subsection, or other provision to
24 other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

25 SEC. 9. All Acts or parts of Acts in any way inconsistent

A BILL

To amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

By Mr. McGREGOR

FEBRUARY 9, 1954

Referred to the Committee on Public Works

83^D CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 7841

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 12, 1954

Mr. ANGELL introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Public Works

A BILL

To amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the
4 Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat.
5 355), and all Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary
6 thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the
7 sum of \$600,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,
8 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30,
9 1957.

1 The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be
2 available for expenditure as follows:

3 (a) \$270,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid pri-
4 mary highway system.

5 (b) \$180,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid sec-
6 ondary highway system.

7 (c) \$150,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid
8 primary highway system in urban areas, and for projects
9 on approved extensions of the Federal-aid secondary system
10 within urban areas.

11 The sums authorized by this section for each fiscal year,
12 respectively, shall be apportioned among the several States
13 in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with
14 the formulas set forth in section 4 of the Federal-Aid High-
15 way Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat.
16 838).

17 Any sums apportioned to any State under the provi-
18 sion of this section shall be available for expenditure in
19 that State for two years after the close of the fiscal year
20 for which such sums are authorized, and any amount so
21 apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period
22 shall lapse: *Provided*, That such funds for any fiscal year
23 shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to
24 the total of the sums apportioned to the State for such
25 fiscal year is covered by formal agreements with the Sec-

1 retary of Commerce for the improvement of specific projects
2 as provided by this Act: *Provided further*, That in the case
3 of those sums apportioned to any State for projects on the
4 Federal-aid secondary highway system, the Secretary of
5 Commerce shall be deemed to have discharged his responsi-
6 bility relative to the plans, design, inspection, and construc-
7 tion of such secondary road projects upon his receipt and
8 approval of a certified statement by the State highway de-
9 partment setting forth that the plans, design, and construc-
10 tion for such projects are in accord with the approved stand-
11 ards and procedures of the respective States applicable to
12 projects in this category: *Provided further*, That not more
13 than 25 per centum of the amount apportioned to each
14 State under subparagraphs (a), (b), or (c) of this section
15 may be transferred from the apportionment under one sub-
16 paragraph to the apportionment under either of the other sub-
17 paragraphs: *Provided further*, That such transfer is requested
18 by the State highway department and is approved by the Sec-
19 retary of Commerce as being in the public interest: *Provided*
20 *further*, That the total of such transfers shall not increase
21 the original apportionment under any subparagraph by more
22 than 25 per centum: *And provided further*, That nothing
23 herein contained shall be deemed to alter or impair the au-
24 thority contained in the last proviso to subparagraph (b)
25 of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944.

1 SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of expediting the construc-
2 tion, reconstruction, and improvement, inclusive of necessary
3 bridges and tunnels, of the national system of interstate high-
4 ways, designated in accordance with the provisions of section
5 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838),
6 there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional
7 sum of \$200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,
8 1956, and a like additional sum for the fiscal year ending
9 June 30, 1957. The sum herein authorized for each fiscal
10 year shall be apportioned among the several States in the
11 following manner: one-half in the ratio which the popula-
12 tion of each State bears to the total population of all the
13 States, as shown by the latest available Federal census:
14 *Provided*, That no State shall receive less than three-fourths
15 of 1 per centum of the money so apportioned; and one-half
16 in the manner now provided by law for apportionment of
17 funds for the Federal-Aid primary system: *Provided further*,
18 That the Federal share payable on account of any project
19 provided for by funds made available under the provisions of
20 this section shall be determined in the same manner as now
21 provided by law for projects on the Federal-aid primary sys-
22 tem: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Commerce shall
23 not apportion to the States the sum authorized by this section
24 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, unless a Federal
25 excise tax on gasoline in the amount of not less than 2 cents

1 per gallon is in effect on December 31, 1954; and the Sec-
2 retary of Commerce shall not apportion to the States the sum
3 authorized by this section for the fiscal year ending June 30,
4 1957, unless a Federal excise tax on gasoline in the amount
5 of not less than 2 cents per gallon is in effect on December
6 31, 1955.

7 (b) Any sums apportioned to any State under the pro-
8 visions of this section shall be available for expenditure in
9 that State for six months after the close of fiscal year for
10 which such sums are authorized: *Provided*, That such funds
11 for any fiscal year shall be deemed to be expended in such
12 amounts, and at such times as the Secretary of Commerce
13 shall determine that the recipient State has actually incurred
14 contractual obligations thereunder for the performance of
15 specific projects.

16 (c) Any amount apportioned to the States under the
17 provisions of this section unexpended at the end of the
18 period during which it is available for expenditure under
19 the terms of subsection (b) of this section shall be re-
20 apportioned within sixty days thereafter to all the States
21 on the same basis as if it were being apportioned under this
22 section for the first time.

23 SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions
24 of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218);

1 as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized
2 to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of
3 \$22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and
4 a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957: *Pro-*
5 *vided*, That any sums heretofore authorized unobligated on
6 June 30, 1955, shall be canceled as of June 30, 1955;
7 and (2) for forest development roads and trails the sum of
8 \$22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a
9 like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957: *Provided*,
10 That with respect to any proposed construction or recon-
11 struction of a timber access road, advisory public hearings
12 shall be held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area
13 of construction or reconstruction with notice and reasonable
14 opportunity for interested persons to present their views
15 as to the practicability and feasibility of such construction
16 or reconstruction: *Provided further*, That the appropriation
17 herein authorized for forest highways shall be apportioned
18 by the Secretary of Commerce for expenditure in the sev-
19 eral States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico in accordance with the
20 provision of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act
21 of 1950.

22 SEC. 4. (a) For the construction, reconstruction, and
23 improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary
24 bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas ad-

1 ministered by the National Park Service, including areas
2 authorized to be established as national parks and monuments,
3 and national park and monument approach roads authorized
4 by the Act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat. 1053), as
5 amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the
6 sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,
7 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30,
8 1957.

9 (b) For the construction, reconstruction, improvement,
10 and maintenance of parkways, authorized by Acts of Con-
11 gress, on lands to which title is vested in the United States,
12 there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of
13 \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and
14 a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

15 (c) For the construction, improvement, and mainte-
16 nance of Indian reservation roads and bridges and roads and
17 bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian
18 lands under the provisions of the Act approved May 26,
19 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be
20 appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year
21 ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year
22 ending June 30, 1957: *Provided*, That the location, type,
23 and design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be
24 approved by the Secretary of Commerce before any expendi-

1 tures are made thereon, and all such construction shall be
2 under the general supervision of the Secretary of Commerce.

3 SEC. 5. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of
4 section 5 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 (66 Stat.
5 158), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the
6 Department of State, in addition to the sums heretofore
7 authorized, such sums not in excess of \$4,000,000, to be
8 available until expended, as are necessary to complete the
9 United States obligation under the applicable agreement with
10 the Republic of Nicaragua: *Provided*, That the survey and
11 construction work authorized by the said section 5 shall be
12 under the general supervision of the Secretary of Commerce.

13 SEC. 6. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of
14 section 1 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for coop-
15 eration with Central American Republics in the construction
16 of the Inter-American Highway" approved December 26,
17 1941 (55 Stat. 860), as amended by section 11 of the
18 Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7,
19 1950 (64 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized to be
20 appropriated to the Department of State in addition to the
21 sums heretofore authorized, the sum of \$8,000,000 for the
22 fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and a like sum for the
23 fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, to be available until ex-
24 pended, to enable the United States to cooperate with the
25 Governments of the American Republics situated in Central

1 America—that is, with the Governments of the Republics of
2 Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua,
3 and Panama—in the survey and construction of the Inter-
4 American Highway within the borders of the aforesaid
5 Republics, respectively. Not to exceed one-third of the
6 appropriation authorized for each fiscal year may be expended
7 without requiring the country or countries in which such
8 sums may be expended to match any part thereof, if the
9 Secretary of State shall find that the cost of constructing
10 said highway in such country or countries will be beyond
11 their reasonable capacity to bear.

12 SEC. 7. All provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act
13 of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838) ; the
14 Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, approved June 29, 1948
15 (62 Stat. 1105) ; and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950,
16 approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785) ; and the
17 Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952, approved June 25, 1952
18 (66 Stat. 158) , not inconsistent with this Act, shall remain
19 in full force and effect.

20 SEC. 8. If any section, subsection, or other provision of
21 this Act or the application thereof to any person or circum-
22 stance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act and the
23 application of such section, subsection, or other provision to
24 other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

25 SEC. 9. All Acts or parts of Acts in any way inconsistent

1 with the provisions of this Act are hereby repealed, and this
2 Act shall take effect on its passage.

3 SEC. 10. The Secretary of Commerce is hereby directed
4 to cooperate with the State highway departments in a study
5 of the problems posed by necessary relocation and reconstruc-
6 tion of public utilities services resulting from highway im-
7 provements authorized under this Act. Among other things,
8 such a study shall include a review and financial analysis of
9 existing relationships between the State highway depart-
10 ments and affected utilities of all types, and a review of the
11 various State statutes regulating existing relationships, to the
12 end that a full and informative report may be made to the
13 President for transmittal to the Congress of the United States
14 not later than April 1, 1955.

15 SEC. 11. Section 8 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of
16 1944 is amended by inserting after the words "grade crossing
17 eliminations" the words "or toll roads".

18 SEC. 12. This Act may be cited as the "Federal-Aid
19 Highway Act of 1954".

A BILL

To amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ANGELL

FEBRUARY 12, 1954

Referred to the Committee on Public Works

83^D CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

S. 2982

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 19 (legislative day, FEBRUARY 8), 1954

Mr. MARTIN (by request) introduced the following bill; which was read twice
and referred to the Committee on Public Works

A BILL

To amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the
4 Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat.
5 355), and all Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary
6 thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the
7 sum of \$600,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,
8 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30,
9 1957.

1 The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be
2 available for expenditure as follows:

3 (a) \$270,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid pri-
4 mary highway system.

5 (b) \$180,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid sec-
6 ondary highway system.

7 (c) \$150,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid
8 primary highway system in urban areas, and for projects
9 on approved extensions of the Federal-aid secondary system
10 within urban areas.

11 The sums authorized by this section for each fiscal year,
12 respectively, shall be apportioned among the several States
13 in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with
14 the formulas set forth in section 4 of the Federal-Aid High-
15 way Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat.
16 838).

17 Any sums apportioned to any State under the provi-
18 sion of this section shall be available for expenditure in
19 that State for two years after the close of the fiscal year
20 for which such sums are authorized, and any amount so
21 apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period
22 shall lapse: *Provided*, That such funds for any fiscal year
23 shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to
24 the total of the sums apportioned to the State for such
25 fiscal year is covered by formal agreements with the Sec-

1 retary of Commerce for the improvement of specific projects
2 as provided by this Act: *Provided further*, That in the case
3 of those sums apportioned to any State for projects on the
4 Federal-aid secondary highway system, the Secretary of
5 Commerce shall be deemed to have discharged his responsi-
6 bility relative to the plans, design, inspection, and construc-
7 tion of such secondary road projects upon his receipt and
8 approval of a certified statement by the State highway de-
9 partment setting forth that the plans, design, and construc-
10 tion for such projects are in accord with the approved stand-
11 ards and procedures of the respective States applicable to
12 projects in this category: *Provided further*, That not more
13 than 25 per centum of the amount apportioned to each
14 State under subparagraphs (a), (b), or (c) of this section
15 may be transferred from the apportionment under one sub-
16 paragraph to the apportionment under either of the other sub-
17 paragraphs: *Provided further*, That such transfer is requested
18 by the State highway department and is approved by the Sec-
19 retary of Commerce as being in the public interest: *Provided*
20 *further*, That the total of such transfers shall not increase
21 the original apportionment under any subparagraph by more
22 than 25 per centum: *And provided further*, That nothing
23 herein contained shall be deemed to alter or impair the au-
24 thority contained in the last proviso to subparagraph (b)
25 of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944.

1 SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of expediting the construc-
2 tion, reconstruction, and improvement, inclusive of necessary
3 bridges and tunnels, of the national system of interstate high-
4 ways, designated in accordance with the provisions of section
5 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838),
6 there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional
7 sum of \$200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,
8 1956, and a like additional sum for the fiscal year ending
9 June 30, 1957. The sum herein authorized for each fiscal
10 year shall be apportioned among the several States in the
11 following manner: one-half in the ratio which the popula-
12 tion of each State bears to the total population of all the
13 States, as shown by the latest available Federal census:
14 *Provided*, That no State shall receive less than three-fourths
15 of 1 per centum of the money so apportioned; and one-half
16 in the manner now provided by law for apportionment of
17 funds for the Federal-aid primary system: *Provided further*,
18 That the Federal share payable on account of any project
19 provided for by funds made available under the provisions of
20 this section shall be determined in the same manner as now
21 provided by law for projects on the Federal-aid primary sys-
22 tem: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Commerce shall
23 not apportion to the States the sum authorized by this section
24 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, unless a Federal
25 excise tax on gasoline in the amount of not less than 2 cents

1 per gallon is in effect on December 31, 1954; and the Sec-
2 retary of Commerce shall not apportion to the States the sum
3 authorized by this section for the fiscal year ending June 30,
4 1957, unless a Federal excise tax on gasoline in the amount
5 of not less than 2 cents per gallon is in effect on December
6 31, 1955.

7 (b) Any sums apportioned to any State under the pro-
8 visions of this section shall be available for expenditure in
9 that State for six months after the close of fiscal year for
10 which such sums are authorized: *Provided*, That such funds
11 for any fiscal year shall be deemed to be expended in such
12 amounts, and at such times as the Secretary of Commerce
13 shall determine that the recipient State has actually incurred
14 contractual obligations thereunder for the performance of
15 specific projects.

16 (c) Any amount apportioned to the States under the
17 provisions of this section unexpended at the end of the
18 period during which it is available for expenditure under
19 the terms of subsection (b) of this section shall be re-
20 apportioned within sixty days thereafter to all the States
21 on the same basis as if it were being apportioned under this
22 section for the first time.

23 SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions
24 of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218),

1 as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized
2 to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of
3 \$22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and
4 a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957: *Pro-*
5 *vided*, That any sums heretofore authorized unobligated on
6 June 30, 1955, shall be canceled as of June 30, 1955;
7 and (2) for forest development roads and trails the sum of
8 \$22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a
9 like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957: *Provided*,
10 That with respect to any proposed construction or recon-
11 struction of a timber access road, advisory public hearings
12 shall be held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area
13 of construction or reconstruction with notice and reasonable
14 opportunity for interested persons to present their views
15 as to the practicability and feasibility of such construction
16 or reconstruction: *Provided further*, That the appropriation
17 herein authorized for forest highways shall be apportioned
18 by the Secretary of Commerce for expenditure in the sev-
19 eral States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico in accordance with the
20 provision of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act
21 of 1950.

22 SEC. 4. (a) For the construction, reconstruction, and
23 improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary
24 bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas ad-
25 ministered by the National Park Service, including areas

1 authorized to be established as national parks and monuments,
2 and national park and monument approach roads authorized
3 by the Act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat. 1053), as
4 amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the
5 sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,
6 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30,
7 1957.

8 (b) For the construction, reconstruction, improvement,
9 and maintenance of parkways, authorized by Acts of Con-
10 gress, on lands to which title is vested in the United States,
11 there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of
12 \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and
13 a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

14 (c) For the construction, improvement, and mainte-
15 nance of Indian reservation roads and bridges and roads and
16 bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian
17 lands under the provisions of the Act approved May 26,
18 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be
19 appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year
20 ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year
21 ending June 30, 1957: *Provided*, That the location, type,
22 and design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be
23 approved by the Secretary of Commerce before any expendi-
24 tures are made thereon, and all such construction shall be
25 under the general supervision of the Secretary of Commerce.

1 SEC. 5. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of
2 section 5 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 (66 Stat.
3 158), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the
4 Department of State, in addition to the sums heretofore
5 authorized, such sums not in excess of \$4,000,000, to be
6 available until expended, as are necessary to complete the
7 United States obligation under the applicable agreement with
8 the Republic of Nicaragua: *Provided*, That the survey and
9 construction work authorized by the said section 5 shall be
10 under the general supervision of the Secretary of Commerce.

11 SEC. 6. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of
12 section 1 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for coop-
13 eration with Central American Republics in the construction
14 of the Inter-American Highway" approved December 26,
15 1941 (55 Stat. 860), as amended by section 11 of the
16 Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7,
17 1950 (64 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized to be
18 appropriated to the Department of State in addition to the
19 sums heretofore authorized, the sum of \$8,000,000 for the
20 fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and a like sum for the
21 fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, to be available until ex-
22 pended, to enable the United States to cooperate with the
23 Governments of the American Republics situated in Central
24 America—that is, with the Governments of the Republics of
25 Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua,

1 and Panama—in the survey and construction of the Inter-
2 American Highway within the borders of the aforesaid
3 Republics, respectively. Not to exceed one-third of the
4 appropriation authorized for each fiscal year may be ex-
5 pended without requiring the country or countries in which
6 such sums may be expended to match any part thereof, if
7 the Secretary of State shall find that the cost of constructing
8 said highway in such country or countries will be beyond
9 their reasonable capacity to bear.

10 SEC. 7. All provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act
11 of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838) ; the
12 Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, approved June 29, 1948
13 (62 Stat. 1105) ; and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of
14 1950, approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785) ; and the
15 Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952, approved June 25, 1952
16 (66 Stat. 158), not inconsistent with this Act, shall remain
17 in full force and effect.

18 SEC. 8. If any section, subsection, or other provision of
19 this Act or the application thereof to any person or circum-
20 stance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act and the
21 application of such section, subsection, or other provision to
22 other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

23 SEC. 9. All Acts or parts of Acts in any way inconsistent
24 with the provisions of this Act are hereby repealed, and this
25 Act shall take effect on its passage.

1 SEC. 10. The Secretary of Commerce is hereby directed
2 to cooperate with the State highway departments in a study
3 of the problems posed by necessary relocation and reconstruc-
4 tion of public utilities services resulting from highway im-
5 provements authorized under this Act. Among other things,
6 such a study shall include a review and financial analysis of
7 existing relationships between the State highway depart-
8 ments and affected utilities of all types, and a review of the
9 various State statutes regulating existing relationships, to the
10 end that a full and informative report may be made to the
11 President for transmittal to the Congress of the United States
12 not later than April 1, 1955.

13 SEC. 11. Section 8 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of
14 1944 is amended by inserting after the words "grade crossing
15 eliminations" the words "or toll roads".

16 SEC. 12. This Act may be cited as the "Federal-Aid
17 Highway Act of 1954".

A BILL

To amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

By Mr. MARTIN

FEBRUARY 19 (legislative day, FEBRUARY 8), 1954
Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Public Works

83^D CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 8023

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 23, 1954

Mr. GEORGE introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Public Works

A BILL

To amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the
4 Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat.
5 355), and all Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary
6 thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the
7 sum of \$600,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,
8 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30,
9 1957.

1 The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be
2 available for expenditure as follows:

3 (a) \$270,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid pri-
4 mary highway system.

5 (b) \$180,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid sec-
6 ondary highway system.

7 (c) \$150,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid
8 primary highway system in urban areas, and for projects
9 on approved extensions of the Federal-aid secondary system
10 within urban areas.

11 The sums authorized by this section for each fiscal year,
12 respectively, shall be apportioned among the several States
13 in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with
14 the formulas set forth in section 4 of the Federal-Aid High-
15 way Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat.
16 838).

17 Any sums apportioned to any State under the provi-
18 sion of this section shall be available for expenditure in
19 that State for two years after the close of the fiscal year
20 for which such sums are authorized, and any amount so
21 apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period
22 shall lapse: *Provided*, That such funds for any fiscal year
23 shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to
24 the total of the sums apportioned to the State for such
25 fiscal year is covered by formal agreements with the Sec-

1 retary of Commerce for the improvement of specific projects
2 as provided by this Act: *Provided further*, That in the case
3 of those sums apportioned to any State for projects on the
4 Federal-aid secondary highway system, the Secretary of
5 Commerce shall be deemed to have discharged his responsi-
6 bility relative to the plans, design, inspection, and construc-
7 tion of such secondary road projects upon his receipt and
8 approval of a certified statement by the State highway de-
9 partment setting forth that the plans, design, and construc-
10 tion for such projects are in accord with the approved stand-
11 ards and procedures of the respective States applicable to
12 projects in this category: *Provided further*, That not more
13 than 25 per centum of the amount apportioned to each
14 State under subparagraphs (a), (b), or (c) of this section
15 may be transferred from the apportionment under one sub-
16 paragraph to the apportionment under either of the other sub-
17 paragraphs: *Provided further*, That such transfer is requested
18 by the State highway department and is approved by the Sec-
19 retary of Commerce as being in the public interest: *Provided*
20 *further*, That the total of such transfers shall not increase
21 the original apportionment under any subparagraph by more
22 than 25 per centum: *And provided further*, That nothing
23 herein contained shall be deemed to alter or impair the au-
24 thority contained in the last proviso to subparagraph (b)
25 of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944.

1 SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of expediting the construc-
2 tion, reconstruction, and improvement, inclusive of necessary
3 bridges and tunnels, of the national system of interstate high-
4 ways, designated in accordance with the provisions of section
5 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838),
6 there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional
7 sum of \$200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,
8 1956, and a like additional sum for the fiscal year ending
9 June 30, 1957. The sum herein authorized for each fiscal
10 year shall be apportioned among the several States in the
11 following manner: one-half in the ratio which the popula-
12 tion of each State bears to the total population of all the
13 States, as shown by the latest available Federal census:
14 *Provided*, That no State shall receive less than three-fourths
15 of 1 per centum of the money so apportioned; and one-half
16 in the manner now provided by law for apportionment of
17 funds for the Federal-aid primary system: *Provided further*,
18 That the Federal share payable on account of any project
19 provided for by funds made available under the provisions of
20 this section shall be determined in the same manner as now
21 provided by law for projects on the Federal-aid primary sys-
22 tem: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Commerce shall
23 not apportion to the States the sum authorized by this section
24 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, unless a Federal
25 excise tax on gasoline in the amount of not less than 2 cents

1 per gallon is in effect on December 31, 1954; and the Sec-
2 retary of Commerce shall not apportion to the States the sum
3 authorized by this section for the fiscal year ending June 30,
4 1957, unless a Federal excise tax on gasoline in the amount
5 of not less than 2 cents per gallon is in effect on December
6 31, 1955.

7 (b) Any sums apportioned to any State under the pro-
8 visions of this section shall be available for expenditure in
9 that State for one year after the close of fiscal year for
10 which such sums are authorized: *Provided*, That such funds
11 for any fiscal year shall be deemed to be expended in such
12 amounts, and at such times as the Secretary of Commerce
13 shall determine that the recipient State has actually incurred
14 contractual obligations thereunder for the performance of
15 specific projects.

16 (c) Any amount apportioned to the States under the
17 provisions of this section unexpended at the end of the
18 period during which it is available for expenditure under
19 the terms of subsection (b) of this section shall be re-
20 apportioned within sixty days thereafter to all the States
21 on the same basis as if it were being apportioned under this
22 section for the first time.

23 SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions
24 of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218),

1 as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized
2 to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of
3 \$22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and
4 a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957: *Pro-*
5 *vided*, That any sums heretofore authorized and unobligated
6 on June 30, 1955, shall be canceled as of June 30, 1955;
7 and (2) for forest development roads and trails the sum of
8 \$22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a
9 like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957: *Provided*,
10 That with respect to any proposed construction or recon-
11 struction of a timber access road, advisory public hearings
12 shall be held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area
13 of construction or reconstruction with notice and reasonable
14 opportunity for interested persons to present their views
15 as to the practicability and feasibility of such construction
16 or reconstruction: *Provided further*, That the appropriation
17 herein authorized for forest highways shall be apportioned
18 by the Secretary of Commerce for expenditure in the sev-
19 eral States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico in accordance with the
20 provision of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act
21 of 1950.

22 SEC. 4. (a) For the construction, reconstruction, and
23 improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary
24 bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas ad-

1 ministered by the National Park Service, including areas
2 authorized to be established as national parks and monuments,
3 and national park and monument approach roads authorized
4 by the Act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat. 1053), as
5 amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the
6 sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,
7 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30,
8 1957.

9 (b) For the construction, reconstruction, improvement,
10 and maintenance of parkways, authorized by Acts of Con-
11 gress, on lands to which title is vested in the United States,
12 there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of
13 \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and
14 a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

15 (c) For the construction, improvement, and mainte-
16 nance of Indian reservation roads and bridges and roads and
17 bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian
18 lands under the provisions of the Act approved May 26,
19 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be
20 appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year
21 ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year
22 ending June 30, 1957: *Provided*, That the location, type,
23 and design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be
24 approved by the Secretary of Commerce before any expendi-

1 tures are made thereon, and all such construction shall be
2 under the general supervision of the Secretary of Commerce.

3 SEC. 5. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of
4 section 5 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 (66 Stat.
5 158), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the
6 Department of State, in addition to the sums heretofore
7 authorized, such sums not in excess of \$4,000,000, to be
8 available until expended, as are necessary to complete the
9 United States obligation under the applicable agreement with
10 the Republic of Nicaragua: *Provided*, That the survey and
11 construction work authorized by the said section 5 shall be
12 under the general supervision of the Secretary of Commerce.

13 SEC. 6. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of
14 section 1 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for coop-
15 eration with Central American Republics in the construction
16 of the Inter-American Highway" approved December 26,
17 1941 (55 Stat. 860), as amended by section 11 of the
18 Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7,
19 1950 (64 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized to be
20 appropriated to the Department of State in addition to the
21 sums heretofore authorized, the sum of \$8,000,000 for the
22 fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and a like sum for the
23 fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, to be available until ex-
24 pended, to enable the United States to cooperate with the
25 Governments of the American Republics situated in Central

1 America—that is, with the Governments of the Republics of
2 Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua,
3 and Panama—in the survey and construction of the Inter-
4 American Highway within the borders of the aforesaid
5 Republics, respectively. Not to exceed one-third of the
6 appropriation authorized for each fiscal year may be expended
7 without requiring the country or countries in which such
8 sums may be expended to match any part thereof, if the
9 Secretary of State shall find that the cost of constructing
10 said highway in such country or countries will be beyond
11 their reasonable capacity to bear.

12 SEC. 7. All provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act
13 of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838) ; the
14 Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, approved June 29, 1948
15 (62 Stat. 1105) ; and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950,
16 approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785) ; and the
17 Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952, approved June 25, 1952
18 (66 Stat. 158) , not inconsistent with this Act, shall remain
19 in full force and effect.

20 SEC. 8. If any section, subsection, or other provision of
21 this Act or the application thereof to any person or circum-
22 stance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act and the
23 application of such section, subsection, or other provision to
24 other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

25 SEC. 9. All Acts or parts of Acts in any way inconsistent

1 with the provisions of this Act are hereby repealed, and this
2 Act shall take effect on its passage.

3 SEC. 10. The Secretary of Commerce is hereby directed
4 to cooperate with the State highway departments in a study
5 of the problems posed by necessary relocation and reconstruc-
6 tion of public utilities services resulting from highway im-
7 provements authorized under this Act. Among other things,
8 such a study shall include a review and financial analysis of
9 existing relationships between the State highway depart-
10 ments and affected utilities of all types, and a review of the
11 various State statutes regulating existing relationships, to the
12 end that a full and informative report may be made to the
13 President for transmittal to the Congress of the United States
14 not later than April 1, 1955.

15 SEC. 11. Section 8 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of
16 1944 is amended by inserting after the words "grade crossing
17 eliminations" the words "or toll roads".

18 SEC. 12. This Act may be cited as the "Federal-Aid
19 Highway Act of 1954".

A BILL

To amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

By Mr. GEORGE

FEBRUARY 23, 1954

Referred to the Committee on Public Works

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued March 2, 1954
For actions of March 1, 1954
83rd-2nd, No. 33

CONTENTS

Acreage allotments.....14,23	FHA.....11	Reclamation.....17
Agricultural Adjustment Act.....20	Foreign trade.....7	Road authorizations.....3
Appropriations.....11	Forestry.....3	St. Lawrence Waterway...24
Banking and Currency.....8	Grains.....21	Soil conservation.....14,23
C.C.C.....2	Insect control.....5	Storage facilities.....21
Dairy industry.....10,18,21	Loans, farm.....11	Surplus commodities 13,16,23
Economic report.....4	Organization, exec.....9	Tobacco.....15
Electrification.....12,24	Personnel.....6,19	Transportation.....16
Farm labor.....1	Postal rates.....22	TV.....24
Farm program.....23	Prices, supports 2,4,10,18,20,21,23	

HIGHLIGHTS: House debated Mexican farm labor bill. House committee reported bill to increase CCC borrowing power. House committee voted to report road authorizations bill. House received report of Joint Committee on Economic Report, recommending postponement of flexible price supports. Senate passed bill to continue Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Ready for President. Sen. Wiley spoke favoring 90% dairy price supports and opposing imports of surplus commodities. Sen. Hill introduced and discussed bill to use surplus commodities for unemployed. Sen. Humphrey introduced and discussed bill to require ACP payments for diverted acreage. Reps. Andersen and Horan introduced, and Rep. Andersen discussed, bills to authorize CCC to pay transportation of donated surplus commodities. Sen. Clements introduced and discussed bill to increase penalty on excess tobacco.

HOUSE

1. FARM LABOR. Began debate on H. J. Res. 355, to continue the Mexican farm labor program in the absence of an agreement with Mexico (pp. 2302-13).
2. COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION. The Banking and Currency Committee reported with amendment H. R. 7339, to increase the borrowing power of CCC from \$6,750,000,000 to \$8,500,000,000. The amendment strikes out the effective date of July 1, 1954, and makes the bill effective upon enactment. S. 2714, a companion bill, has been reported in the Senate. (H. Rept. 1258.) (pp.2313,D209.)
3. ROAD AUTHORIZATIONS. The Public Works Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 8127, which includes appropriation authorizations for forest highways and forest roads and trails (p. D210). This is a revision of H. R. 7818.
4. ECONOMIC REPORT. Received the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, which was submitted by the Committee on Feb. 26 after adjournment of the House (H. Rept. 1256)(p. 2313). The committee report recommends postponement of flexible price supports.

5. ~~INSECT CONTROL.~~ Rep. Willis recommended "an adequate sweetpotato weevil-control program and a continuation of the pink-bollworm control project" (pp. 2294-5).
6. ~~PERSONNEL.~~ Rep. Crosser spoke in favor of a Federal-employees pay raise (p. 2295).
7. ~~FOREIGN TRADE.~~ Rep. Tollefson requested tariff increases for nuts, flowers, and other commodities (p. 2293).
8. ~~BANKING AND CURRENCY.~~ Both Houses received from the President the report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems; to House Foreign Affairs Committee and Senate Banking and Currency Committee (H. Doc. 338) (pp. 2259, 2291).

SENATE

9. ~~INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS.~~ Passed without amendment H. R. 8069, to continue the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations from Mar. 1, 1954, to Mar. 1, 1955 (p. 2276). This bill will now be sent to the President.
10. ~~PRICE SUPPORTS.~~ Sen. Wiley spoke favoring 90%-of-parity price supports for dairy products and opposing imports of "any commodity...of which we have a surplus in this country" (pp. 2272-5).
Sen. Langer inserted a constituent's letter criticizing the administration's price-support program, etc. (p. 2261).
11. ~~FARM LOANS.~~ Sen. Langer inserted a Nonpartisan League resolution favoring additional FHA appropriations in N. Dak. and requesting that the State be declared a disaster area (p. 2260).
12. ~~ELECTRIFICATION.~~ Sen. Langer inserted an International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers' local telegram stating that the Interior Department's proposed power policy "means almost certain destruction and bankruptcy to RFA cooperatives" (p. 2261).

BILLS INTRODUCED

13. ~~SURPLUS COMMODITIES.~~ S. 3044, by Sen. Hill (for himself and others), to provide adequate diets for the unemployed and their families in distress areas of unemployment; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 2262). Remarks of author (p. 2263).
14. ~~ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS.~~ S. 3049, by Sen. Humphrey, to require ACP payments for acreage diverted from crop production by acreage allotments; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 2262). Remarks of author (pp. 2267-8).
15. ~~TOBACCO MARKETING.~~ S. 3050, by Sen. Clements (for himself and others), to increase the penalty rate on tobacco marketed in excess of acreage allotments from 40 percent of the previous year's average price to 50 percent of the previous year's average price; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 2262). Remarks of author (p. 2268).
16. ~~SURPLUS COMMODITIES.~~ H. R. 8117, by Rep. Andersen, and H. R. 8118, by Rep. Horan, to authorize CCC to pay transportation costs in connection with donation of surplus commodities; to Agriculture Committee (p. 2313). Remarks of author (pp. 2291-2).
17. ~~RECLAMATION.~~ H. R. 8121, by Rep. Engle, to amend the Reclamation Project Act of

83^D CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 8127

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 1, 1954

Mr. MCGREGOR introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Public Works

A BILL

To amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the
4 Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat.
5 355), and all Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary
6 thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the
7 sum of \$600,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,
8 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30,
9 1957.

1 The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be
2 available for expenditure as follows:

3 (a) \$270,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid pri-
4 mary highway system.

5 (b) \$180,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid sec-
6 ondary highway system.

7 (c) \$150,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid
8 primary highway system in urban areas, and for projects
9 on approved extensions of the Federal-aid secondary system
10 within urban areas.

11 The sums authorized by this section for each fiscal year,
12 respectively, shall be apportioned among the several States
13 in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with
14 the formulas set forth in section 4 of the Federal-Aid High-
15 way Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat.
16 838).

17 Any sums apportioned to any State under the provi-
18 sion of this section shall be available for expenditure in
19 that State for two years after the close of the fiscal year
20 for which such sums are authorized, and any amount so
21 apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period
22 shall lapse: *Provided*, That such funds for any fiscal year
23 shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to
24 the total of the sums apportioned to the State for such
25 fiscal year is covered by formal agreements with the Sec-

1 retary of Commerce for the improvement of specific projects
2 as provided by this Act: *Provided further*, That in the case
3 of those sums apportioned to any State for projects on the
4 Federal-aid secondary highway system, the Secretary of
5 commerce may discharge his responsibility relative to the
6 plans, design, inspection, and construction of such secondary
7 road projects upon his receipt and approval of a certified
8 statement by the State highway department setting forth
9 that the plans, design, and construction for such projects are
10 in accord with the standards and procedures of the respective
11 States applicable to projects in this category approved by
12 him: *Provided further*, That not more than 25 per centum
13 of the amount apportioned to each State under subpara-
14 graphs (a), (b), or (c) of this section may be transferred
15 from the apportionment under one subparagraph to the
16 apportionment under either of the other subparagraphs:
17 *Provided further*, That such transfer is requested by the
18 State highway department and is approved by the Secretary
19 of Commerce as being in the public interest: *Provided fur-*
20 *ther*, That the total of such transfers shall not increase
21 the original apportionment under any subparagraph by
22 more than 25 per centum: *Provided further*, that the trans-
23 fers hereinabove permitted for funds authorized to be appro-
24 priated for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1956, and
25 June 30, 1957, shall likewise be permitted on the same

1 basis for funds heretofore or hereafter authorized to be ap-
2 propriated for any prior or subsequent fiscal year: *And pro-*
3 *vided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be deemed
4 to alter or impair the authority contained in the last proviso
5 to subparagraph (b) of section 3 of the Federal-Aid High-
6 way Act of 1944.

7 SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of expediting the construc-
8 tion, reconstruction, and improvement, inclusive of necessary
9 bridges and tunnels, of the national system of interstate high-
10 ways, including extensions thereof through urban areas,
11 designated in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of
12 the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838),
13 there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional
14 sum of \$200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,
15 1956, and a like additional sum for the fiscal year ending
16 June 30, 1957. The sum herein authorized for each fiscal
17 year shall be apportioned among the several States in the
18 following manner: one-half in the ratio which the popula-
19 tion of each State bears to the total population of all the
20 States, as shown by the latest available Federal census:
21 *Provided*, That no State shall receive less than three-fourths
22 of 1 per centum of the money so apportioned; and one-half
23 in the manner now provided by law for apportionment of
24 funds for the Federal-Aid primary system: *Provided further*,

1 That the Federal share payable on account of any
2 project on the national system of interstate highways provided
3 for by funds made available under the provisions of this sec-
4 tion shall be increased to 60 per centum of the total cost
5 thereof, plus a percentage of the remaining 40 per centum of
6 such cost in any State containing unappropriated and unre-
7 served public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual
8 and tribal, exceeding 5 per centum of the total area of all
9 lands therein, equal to the percentage that the area of such
10 lands in such State is of its total area: Provided fur-
11 ther, That the Secretary of Commerce shall not ap-
12 portion to the States the sum authorized by this section
13 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, unless a Federal
14 excise tax on gasoline in the amount of not less than 2 cents
15 per gallon is in effect on September 30, 1954; and the Secre-
16 tary of Commerce shall not apportion to the States the sum
17 authorized by this section for the fiscal year ending June 30,
18 1957, unless a Federal excise tax on gasoline in the amount
19 of not less than 2 cents per gallon is in effect on September
20 30, 1955.

21 (b) Any sums apportioned to any State under the pro-
22 visions of this section shall be available for expenditure in
23 that State for two years after the close of fiscal year for which

1 such sums are authorized: *Provided*, That such funds shall be
2 deemed to be expended upon execution of formal agreements
3 with the Secretary of Commerce for the improvement of
4 specific projects under this section.

5 (c) Any amount apportioned to the States under the
6 provisions of this section unexpended at the end of the
7 period during which it is available for expenditure under
8 the terms of subsection (b) of this section shall lapse.

9 SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions
10 of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218),
11 as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized
12 to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of
13 \$22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and
14 a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957:
15 *Provided*, That the authorization in section 3 of the Federal-
16 Aid Highway Act of 1952 for forest highways for the fiscal
17 year ending June 30, 1955, is hereby canceled; and (2)
18 for forest development roads and trails the sum of \$22,500,-
19 000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like
20 sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957: *Provided*,
21 That with respect to any proposed construction or recon-
22 struction of a timber access road, advisory public hearings
23 shall be held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area
24 of construction or reconstruction with notice and reasonable

1 opportunity for interested persons to present their views
2 as to the practicability and feasibility of such construction
3 or reconstruction: *Provided further*, That hereafter funds
4 available for forest development roads and trails shall also
5 be available for vehicular parking areas: *Provided further*,
6 That the appropriation herein authorized for forest highways
7 shall be apportioned by the Secretary of Commerce for ex-
8 penditure in the several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico in
9 accordance with the provision of section 3 of the Federal-
10 Aid Highway Act of 1950.

11 SEC. 4. (a) For the construction, reconstruction, and
12 improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary
13 bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas ad-
14 ministered by the National Park Service, including areas
15 authorized to be established as national parks and monu-
16 ments, and national park and monument approach roads
17 authorized by the Act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat. 1053),
18 as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated
19 the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,
20 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30,
21 1957.

22 (b) For the construction, reconstruction, and improve-
23 ment of parkways, authorized by Acts of Congress, on lands
24 to which title is vested in the United States, there is hereby

1 authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for
2 the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for
3 the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

4 (c) For the construction, improvement, and mainte-
5 nance of Indian reservation roads and bridges and roads and
6 bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian
7 lands under the provisions of the Act approved May 26,
8 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be
9 appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year
10 ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year
11 ending June 30, 1957: *Provided*, That the location, type,
12 and design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be
13 approved by the Secretary of Commerce before any expendi-
14 tures are made thereon, and all such construction shall be
15 under the general supervision of the Secretary of Commerce.

16 SEC. 5. Any unappropriated balance of the sums hereto-
17 fore authorized to be appropriated by sections 5 and 6 of
18 the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 158), for
19 the Rama Road in Nicaragua and the Inter-American High-
20 way, respectively, for the fiscal years 1953 and 1954, shall
21 continue to be authorized to be appropriated for such purposes
22 for the fiscal years 1955 and 1956.

23 SEC. 6. All provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act
24 of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838); the

1 Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, approved June 29, 1948
2 (62 Stat. 1105) ; and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950,
3 approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785) ; and the
4 Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952, approved June 25, 1952
5 (66 Stat. 158), not inconsistent with this Act, shall remain
6 in full force and effect.

7 SEC. 7. If any section, subsection, or other provision of
8 this Act or the application thereof to any person or circum-
9 stance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act and the
10 application of such section, subsection, or other provision to
11 other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

12 SEC. 8. All Acts or parts of Acts in any way inconsis-
13 tent with the provisions of this Act are hereby repealed, and
14 this Act shall take effect on its passage.

15 SEC. 9. The Secretary of Commerce is hereby directed
16 to make a study in cooperation with the State highway
17 departments and other parties in interest relative to the prob-
18 lems posed by necessary relocation and reconstruction of
19 public utilities services resulting from highway improvements
20 authorized under this Act. Among other things, such a study
21 shall include a review and financial analysis of existing
22 relationships between the State highway departments and
23 affected utilities of all types, and a review of the various
24 State statutes regulating existing relationships, to the end

1 that a full and informative report may be made to the
2 President for transmittal to the Congress of the United States
3 not later than February 1, 1955.

4 SEC. 10. The term "highway", as defined in section 2
5 of the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921 (42 Stat.
6 212), as amended and supplemented, shall be deemed to
7 include "tunnels".

8 SEC. 11. The Secretary of Commerce may approve as
9 a part of the Federal-aid secondary system, extensions
10 through urban areas, connecting points on that system, pro-
11 vided that Federal participation in projects on such exten-
12 sions shall be limited to urban funds.

13 SEC. 12. For the purpose of expediting the interstate
14 planning and coordination of a continuous Great River Road
15 and appurtenances thereto traversing the Mississippi Valley
16 from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico in general conformity
17 with the provisions of the Federal Aid Road Act of July 11,
18 1916, as amended and supplemented, and with the recom-
19 mended plan set forth in the joint report submitted to the
20 Congress November 28, 1951, by the Secretaries of Com-
21 merce and Interior pursuant to the Act of August 24, 1949
22 (Public Law 262, Eighty-first Congress), there is hereby
23 authorized to be expended by the Secretary of Commerce
24 from general administrative funds not to exceed \$250,000;
25 the amount expended under this section shall be apportioned

1 among the ten States bordering the Mississippi River in pro-
2 portion to the amount allocated by these respective States for
3 the improvement and extension of existing sections of this
4 highway project as approved by the Secretary of Commerce
5 in cooperation with other public agencies concerned there-
6 with.

7 SEC. 13. This Act may be cited as the “Federal-Aid
8 Highway Act of 1954”.

A BILL

To amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

By Mr. Mcgregor

MARCH 1, 1954

Referred to the Committee on Public Works

Consent Calendar: The following bills were passed on the call of the Consent Calendar:

Cleared for President:

Land conveyance: S. 1160, conveyance of certain land to the city of Tucson, Ariz.

Sent to the Senate without amendment:

Hawaii: H. R. 2848, to place the wharves and landings constructed or controlled by the Republic of Hawaii completely under the Territorial government.

Aeronautics: H. R. 5627, increasing limitation on the total sums expended annually for graduate study for professional personnel of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

Aeronautics: H. R. 7541, to promote the national defense by including a representative of the Department of Defense as a member of the NACA.

Sent to the Senate, amended:

Thailand citizens: S. J. Res. 34, to permit two citizens of the Kingdom of Thailand to receive instruction at the U. S. Military Academy.

Land conveyance: H. R. 232, to provide for the conveyance to the State of Indiana of certain surplus real property situated in Marion County, Ind.

Retired-pay checkage: H. R. 1433, to prevent retroactive checkage of retired pay in cases of certain enlisted men.

Alaska: H. R. 1570, to permit the Territory of Alaska to lease for 55 years (now 10 years) public lands reserved for educational purposes.

Alaska: H. R. 2683, to extend authority to the Secretary of the Interior to provide public works and enter into agreements with applicants under the Alaska Public Works Act of 1950.

Indians: H. R. 3413, to grant oil and gas in lands on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., to individual Indians in certain cases.

Land conveyance: H. R. 7402, to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of St. Joseph, Mich.

Pages 2298-2301

Mexican Agricultural Workers: Concluded all general debate on H. Res. 450, the rule providing 2 hours of debate on H. J. Res. 355, relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico, but adjourned prior to completion of vote on its adoption.

Pages 2301-2313

Program for Tuesday: Adjourned at 2:43 p. m. until Tuesday, March 2, at 12 o'clock noon, when the House will call the Private Calendar and continue the consideration of H. J. Res. 355, relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico.

Committee Meetings

USS "CONSTITUTION" AND "CONSTELLATION"

Committee on Armed Services: The Johnson subcommittee began hearings on H. R. 2316, and related measures, which would restore and maintain the USS *Con-*

stitution and dispose of the USS *Constellation*, *Hartford*, *Olympia*, and *Oregon*. Rear Adm. B. E. Manseau, Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Ships, endorsed enactment of the proposal, while opposition to the disposition of some of the ships was presented by Senators Beall and Butler, of Maryland; and Representatives Friedel, of Maryland; Boykin, of Alabama; and Morano, of Connecticut. Various interested citizen witnesses also opposed H. R. 2316. Hearings will be continued tomorrow morning.

ORDNANCE FACILITY AWARD, CANAL ZONE

Committee on Armed Services: The Subcommittee on Defense completed a hearing today regarding the award of a construction contract for an ordnance facility in Corozal, C. Z. Meeting with the subcommittee were Maj. Gen. Samuel D. Sturgis, Chief of Engineers (Army); and Brig. Gen. David H. Tulley, head of military construction for the Army Engineers.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Committee on Banking and Currency: Voted to report H. R. 7339, to increase borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corp. from \$6,750,000,000 to \$8,500,000,000. The bill was amended to take effect upon its enactment into law, as against the original effective date of July 1, 1954.

D. C. BRIDGES

Committee on the District of Columbia: The Kearns Subcommittee on Streets and Traffic began hearings on two proposals regarding bridge construction. The bills under consideration are H. R. 1980, to construct a bridge over the Potomac River in the vicinity of Jones Point, Va.; and H. R. 6876, to construct a bridge over the Potomac River and Theodore Roosevelt Island in the vicinity of E Street. Testimony in support of the latter measure was furnished by Brig. Gen. Louis W. Prentiss, D. C.'s Engineer Commissioner; George E. Keneipp, D. C.'s Director of Vehicles and Traffic; and J. N. Robertson, D. C.'s Director of Highways, who was accompanied by the following members of that department—S. R. Harrison, Deputy Director; G. I. Sawyer, D. S. Brinkley, and G. E. Marple. Hearings will be continued tomorrow morning when a Virginia State highway official is scheduled to testify.

UNITED NATIONS

Committee on Foreign Affairs: The Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements today heard testimony on the United Nations and specialized agencies from the following witnesses—Mrs. Fay Edgar, Daughters of the American Revolution; Mrs. Austin P. Evans, American Association of University Women; Mrs. William Leetch, American Coalition; Col. John H. Coffman, Defenders of the American Constitution, Inc., and Mrs. Zaio Woodford Schroeder, General Federation of Women's Clubs.

PUBLIC LANDS

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: The D'Ewart subcommittee approved the following bills for reporting to the full committee—H. R. 7110, providing that title to certain school lands shall vest in States under act of 1927 notwithstanding any Federal leases which may be outstanding on such lands at the time they were surveyed (amended); and H. R. 4690, to provide for erection of appropriate markers in national cemeteries in memory of Armed Forces members missing in action. H. R. 518 and 2529, similar bills to H. R. 4690, were ordered tabled. Representative Dawson of Utah, author of H. R. 7110, spoke on behalf of that bill, and James A. Lanigan, Assistant Chief Counsel, Bureau of Land Management, answered questions and submitted departmental suggestions for amendments. Representative LeCompte, author of H. R. 4690, testified in favor of that bill. Adjourned subject to call of the Chair.

HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Ordered reported to the House, a clean bill, which will be introduced in lieu of the amended version of H. R. 7341, to amend the hospital construction and survey provisions of the Public Health Service Act to provide matching grants by the Federal Government to State programs for the construction of certain facilities.

VISAS—IMMIGRATION

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee No. 1 approved the following bills for reporting to the full committee—H. R. 7475 (amended), to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, regarding unused allotments of certain visas; H. R. 8092, to facilitate the entry of Philippine traders; and H. J. Res. 455, a private bill. Also ordered adversely reported to the full committee H. R. 4514, a private immigration bill.

BANKRUPTCY

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee No. 2 heard the following witnesses on H. R. 5706, a bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to make tax liens of States and their subdivisions valid against trustees in bankruptcy—Representative Oakman, author of the bill; Alfred Stolinski, assistant corporation counsel, Detroit, Mich.; Arthur Iverson, deputy attorney general for Michigan; and George H. Deming, director of technical assistance, American Municipal Association.

MEDICAL EDUCATION

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee No. 2 also held a hearing on H. R. 7914 and S. 1748, bills to incorporate the National Fund for Medical Education, and heard Representative Poff, author of H. R. 7914; Chase Mellen, Jr., executive vice president, National Fund for Medical Education; Dr. Louis H. Bauer, president, American Medical Education Foundation, and former president, American Medical Association; and Dr. Stan-

ley E. Dorst, president, Association of American Medical Colleges, and dean of the University of Cincinnati College of Medicine.

MILITARY SEA TRANSPORTATION SERVICE

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: A special subcommittee resumed its executive study of operations of the Military Sea Transportation Service. Recessed until Wednesday afternoon.

POSTAL EMPLOYEE SALARIES

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: The following Members of Congress testified today in connection with the recent proposal by the Postmaster General to increase salaries of about 400,000 postal workers through reclassification—Representatives Addonizio, Albert, Angell, Aspinall, Auchincloss, Battle, Belcher, Bennett of Michigan, Bentley, Boykin, Busbey, Byrd, Campbell, Carnahan, Crosser, Crumpacker, Dingell, Donohue, Edmondson, Ellsworth, Engle, Fino, Forand, Fulton, Gordon, Granahan, Heller, Holtzman, Howell, Javits, King of Pennsylvania, Lane, Lovre, Machrowicz, Mack of Washington, Magnuson, Miller of California, Miller of New York, O'Brien of Michigan, Patman, Perkins, Poff, Rooney, Sadlak, Shafer, Shelley, Short, Sullivan, Thompson of Louisiana, Utt, Van Zandt, Wilson of California, Yorty, and Zablocki.

Statements in lieu of testimony were submitted for the record by Representatives Adair, Blatnik, Bolling, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Curtis of Massachusetts, Delaney, Doyle, Eberharter, Fine, Fogarty, Frelinghuysen, Friedel, Hagen of California, Hinshaw, Hoffman of Illinois, Horan, Kelley of Pennsylvania, Keogh, Kluczynski, McCormack, Oakman, O'Brien of Illinois, Pillion, Price, Rhodes of Arizona, Scudder, Sheehan, Small, Taylor, and Young.

Hearing will be continued tomorrow morning when the views of employee-organization representatives will be received.

ROADS AND HIGHWAYS

Committee on Public Works: Ordered reported to the House H. R. 8127, authorizing appropriations to continue construction of roads and highways. This bill was introduced today by Representative McGregor, and supersedes the amended version of H. R. 7818, the original bill on this subject.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Committee on Rules: Announced that consideration of a rule has been scheduled for Wednesday (10:30 a. m.), on S. 2150, St. Lawrence seaway development project.

Joint Committee Meetings

SEMINOLE INDIANS OF FLORIDA

Joint meeting: Indian Affairs Subcommittees of Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Issued March 5, 1954

For actions of March 4, 1954

83rd-2nd, No. 41

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....20	Health.....33	Research.....24
Agricultural Foreign Service.....35	Incentive awards.....10	Road authorizations...3,27
Appropriations 1,7,16,23,37	Labor, farm.....2	REA.....12
Coffee.....1	Lands, mineral.....29	Soil conservation....6,25
Cotton.....8	reclamation.....6	Statehood.....18,26
Dairy products...12,34,36	Legislative program..11,20	Statistics.....1,8
Dual compensation.....10	Marketing.....31	Sugar agreement.....13
Economic advisers.....10	Personnel.....10,21,35	Surplus food...14,22,31,32
Electrification.....12	Prices, support 4,12,34,36,38	Taxation.....5
Extension Service.12,24,25	Production payments....12	Tobacco allotments.....15
Forests and Forestry 1,3,12,16,23,30	Property.....39	Transportation.....17
Grains.....12,36	Purchasing.....9	Treaties.....19
	Reports.....12	Water resources.....28
		Wool.....12

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed State, Justice, Commerce appropriation bill, agreeing to increase for forest highways. House completed congressional action on Mexican farm labor measure. House and Senate completed congressional action on 2nd supplemental appropriation bill. House committees reported bill to reduce excise taxes and road authorization bill. Senate committee reported wool price supports bill. Rep. Cooley introduced bill to improve marketing facilities for perishables. Rep. Poage spoke in favor of 90% price supports. Sen. Humphrey criticized reduction in dairy price supports. Sens. Ellender and Humphrey claimed Secretary submitted misleading figures on price-support costs; Sen. Aiken defended Secretary on this. Sen. Gillette inserted and discussed correspondence with USDA and other agencies on distributing surplus food to aged and needy.

HOUSE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Continued debate on H. R. 8067, the State, Justice, Commerce appropriation bill for 1955 (pp. 2538-64). Agreed to an amendment by Rep. Coon to increase by \$5,000,000 the amount for forest highways (pp. 2538-43). Agreed to an amendment by Rep. Sullivan to provide \$10,000^{which} shall be used to "renew the compilation of statistics on stocks of coffee on hand" (pp. 2543-4).
2. FARM LABOR. Concurred in the Senate amendment to H. J. Res. 355, to continue the Mexican farm labor program in the absence of an agreement with Mexico (p. 2564). This measure will now be sent to the President.
3. ROAD AUTHORIZATIONS. The Public Works Committee reported without amendment H. R. 8127, to authorize appropriations for roads, including forest highways and forest roads and trails (H. Rept. 1308)(p. 2580).
4. PRICE SUPPORTS. Rep. Poage spoke in favor of continuation of the support of storable commodities at 90% of parity (pp. 2577-8).
5. TAXATION. The Ways and Means Committee reported without amendment H. R. 8224, to reduce excise taxes (H. Rept. 1307)(p. 2564).

6. SOIL CONSERVATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported without amendment H. R. 7057, to authorize the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to transfer, exchange, and dispose of land in the Eden project, Wyo. (H. Rept. 1305)(p. 2580).
7. SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 7996 (pp. 2564, 2517-8). This bill will now be sent to the President.
8. STATISTICS. Received from the Commerce Department a proposed bill to amend the act authorizing the Census Bureau to collect and publish cotton statistics; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 2580). The Post Office and Civil Service Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) S. 2348, to repeal the act authorizing the Census Bureau to collect and publish redcedar shingles statistics (p. D235).
9. PURCHASING. The Judiciary Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) S. 24, to permit review of decisions of Government contracting officers involving questions of fact arising under contracts in cases other than those in which fraud is alleged (three related bills were tabled, H. R. 1839, H. R. 3634, and H. R. 6946) (p. D234).
10. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) H. R. 7774, to establish a uniform system for granting incentive awards to Federal employees. This bill consolidates all presently existing incentive awards programs, places all Federal employees thereunder, and permits the granting of an individual award up to \$25,000. Awards in excess of \$25,000 may be granted by the President, in conjunction with departmental awards (p. D235).
Subcommittees of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee were appointed to study H. R. 5718 and H. R. 5703, to limit the period for collection by the U.S. of compensation received by employees in violation of the dual compensation laws (Rep. St. George, chmn.); and H. R. 6790, providing that the rate of pay for the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers shall be \$17,500 annually (Rep. Harden, chmn.) (p. D235).
11. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM for Fri., Mar. 5 as stated in the "Daily Digest": "The House will vote on passage of" the State-Justice-Commerce appropriation bill for 1955, and will consider bills to increase CCC's borrowing power and authorize cooperation with states, etc., in watershed development (p. D233).

SENATE

12. PRICE SUPPORTS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendments S. 2911, to provide for a special wool price support program through direct payments, loans, etc. (S. Rept. 1044) (p. 2482).
Sen. Humphrey strongly criticized Secretary Benson's reduction of dairy price supports and inserted newspaper articles and other communications opposing the Secretary's action (pp. 2494-8).
Sens. Ellender and Humphrey claimed Secretary Benson submitted misleading figures to Congress on the costs of the price support programs which Sen. Humphrey said "indicated a loss...of \$16 billion, when, as a matter of fact, the losses sustained...amounted to...a little more than \$1 billion." Sen. Ellender also criticized the discrepancy in the REA operations cost figures submitted by the Secretary and those contained in REA's annual report to Congress (pp. 2498-501).

AMENDING AND SUPPLEMENTING THE FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT
APPROVED JULY 11, 1916 (39 STAT. 355), AS AMENDED AND SUP-
PLEMENTED, TO AUTHORIZE APPROPRIATIONS FOR CONTINU-
ING THE CONSTRUCTION OF HIGHWAYS

MARCH 4, 1954.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State
of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. DONDERO, from the Committee on Public Works, submitted the
following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 8127]

The Committee on Public Works, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8127) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The Committee on Public Works held extensive public hearings on H. R. 7818, 7897, 7841, 7678, 7207, 7124, 3529, 3528, 1407, and 14, during which time testimony was offered by Federal, State, and local officials, Members of Congress, and witnesses representing agriculture, industry, highway users, and other groups interested in highway development.

At the conclusion of the hearings, the committee adopted certain amendments to H. R. 7818, and H. R. 8127 was introduced as a substitute for H. R. 7818, as amended.

All the Federal-aid funds thus far authorized through the fiscal year 1955 have been apportioned. Early next year, the legislatures of the States will meet in regular biennial session. This makes it imperative that the present session of Congress enact legislation to provide Federal-aid authorizations for orderly continuation of the program of highway construction for an additional 2-year period so that funds for matching the Federal funds may be made available by the State legislatures.

The bill, therefore, proposes to carry forward the Federal-aid highway program without substantial change from the basic pattern heretofore established by Congress under the Federal-aid Highway Acts of 1944, 1948, 1950, and 1952, and would authorize for such purposes the sum of \$600 million for each of the fiscal years 1956 and 1957, to be available for expenditure as follows:

(a) \$270 million (45 percent) for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system.

(b) \$180 million (30 percent) for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system.

(c) \$150 million (25 percent) for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system in urban areas.

The division of these funds, percentagewise, among the three categories of projects, and their apportionment among the States is on the same basis as provided under existing law.

The testimony before the committee indicated general accord respecting existing Federal-aid procedures but reflected the urgent need for an accelerated highway construction program to overcome the serious deteriorations and deficiencies which have been accumulating at a greater rate than the rate of new construction.

The Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works conducted a national highway study and held extensive hearings on that subject beginning April 15, 1953, and concluding July 14, 1953. As a result of the testimony given by the witnesses which were heard before that subcommittee, and the graphic descriptions furnished by them with respect to traffic congestion, deaths and accidents, highway obsolescence, and other factors, the urgent need for an increased rate of highway improvement was found imperative. Because of the comprehensive hearings and study of the overall highway problem by the subcommittee, and the great number of witnesses which had appeared and testified, this committee at the time it considered the bill which is now being reported was able to confine the testimony of the witnesses to the provisions of the bill itself. The American Association of State Highway Officials, which is an organization composed of the principal highway officials of all of the States, was represented by State highway officials who testified that carefully prepared estimates show that construction in the aggregate amount of approximately \$35 billion would be required now to bring the Federal-aid system of highways up to date, as compared to \$32 billion 2 years ago. The testimony of the witnesses was in accord with the statements made and the data furnished by the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, to the effect that substantially increased authorizations for the national system of highways and especially interstate highways, are considered essential in order to overcome the steadily growing deficiencies and to accelerate the urgently needed improvements to the highways, which are of the greatest importance to national defense.

The committee is of the view that the 2-year annual Federal-aid authorization of \$600 million proposed by the bill for the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems and the \$200 million proposed for the interstate system are necessary and conservative minima in relation to the existing critical backlog of improvements required to provide an adequate highway transportation system—vital to the Nation's economy.

In addition to the authorizations for the regular Federal-aid program, the bill continues the authorizations for work in the national forests, the national parks and monuments, parkways, and roads on Indian reservations.

The reports of the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Interior, the Department of State, Department of Agriculture, and Bureau of the Budget on H. R. 7818, which as amended is H. R. 8127, are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington 25, February 24, 1954.

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO,
*Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
House of Representatives, Washington 25, D. C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request of February 10 for the views of the Department on H. R. 7818, a bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

Attached is a statement prepared by the Bureau of Public Roads favoring enactment of the bill subject to certain amendments. The Department concurs in this statement with the addition of a further amendment providing that the first proviso appearing on page 3 of the bill be amended to read as follows:

"*Provided further*, That in the case of those sums apportioned to any State for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system, the Secretary of Commerce may discharge his responsibility relative to the plans, design, inspection, and construction of such secondary road projects upon his receipt and approval of a certified statement by the State highway department setting forth that the plans, design, and construction for such projects are in accord with the standards and procedures of the respective States applicable to projects in this category approved by him."

This amendment is in accord with one contained in a letter dated February 14, 1954, from the Bureau of the Budget to your committee.

If we can be of further assistance to you in this matter, please call upon us.

Sincerely yours,

SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce.

(Original delivered to room 1414, New House Office Building, 11:25 a. m. February 24, 1954.)

STATEMENT OF THE BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN PENDING ROAD BILLS AND PARTICULARLY H. R. 7818, A BILL TO AMEND AND SUPPLEMENT THE FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT APPROVED JULY 11, 1916 (39 STAT. 355), AS AMENDED AND SUPPLEMENTED, TO AUTHORIZE APPROPRIATIONS FOR CONTINUING THE CONSTRUCTION OF HIGHWAYS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

In view of the length of the bill and in order that this statement may not be unduly long, no general analysis of its provisions will be attempted. There is, however, attached a summary of the provisions of the bill as compared to the provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952.

Section 1 of the bill would authorize \$600 million for each of the fiscal years 1956 and 1957 for Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban projects. Section 2 of the bill would authorize an additional amount of \$200 million for each of the fiscal years 1956 and 1957 for projects on the national system of interstate highways. The level of authorizations as proposed in the bill will make possible orderly continuation of needed improvements on the systems of Federal-aid highways, including the national system of interstate highways. The substantially increased authorizations proposed for the national system of interstate highways are considered essential in order to overcome the steadily growing deficiencies and to accelerate the urgently needed improvements on that system which consists of a limited mileage of highways of greatest importance to the national defense.

Based on careful consideration of the bill, certain amendments thereto are considered desirable. These amendments and the reasons therefor are given below:

The second proviso on page 3, would authorize up to 25 percent of a State's apportionment of primary, secondary, or urban funds to be transferred from one apportionment to another, if certified by the State and approved by the Secretary of Commerce as being in the public interest. This is a new provision designed to provide increased flexibility, within reasonable limitations, in the use of these three categories of apportioned funds. The adoption of this new language would seem desirable. It is recommended, however, that such transfers also be permitted with respect to funds heretofore or hereafter authorized. This can be accomplished by adding after "25 per centum:" in line 22, page 3, a new proviso as follows:

"Provided further, That the transfers hereinabove permitted for funds authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1956, and June 30, 1957, shall likewise be permitted on the same basis for funds heretofore or hereafter authorized to be appropriated for any prior or subsequent fiscal year."

Section 2 (a), page 4, provides that funds authorized for the national system of interstate highways may be used for the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of such system, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels. The term "highway" as presently defined in the law includes bridges but no reference is made therein to tunnels and it would seem advisable to have the definition of the term "highway" amended to include tunnels. In such event reference to bridges and tunnels in section 2 (a) would be unnecessary. It is recommended, therefore, that the words "inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels" in lines 2 and 3, on page 4, be stricken from the bill, and that a sentence be added to section 11 of the bill, as follows:

"The term 'highway,' as defined in section 2 of the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921 (42 Stat. 212), as amended and supplemented, shall be deemed to include tunnels."

The proviso in section 2 (b), on page 5, provides that the interstate funds shall be deemed to be expended "in such amounts, and at such times as the Secretary of Commerce shall determine that the recipient State has actually incurred contractual obligations thereunder for the performance of specific projects." Such language is somewhat at variance with provisions of existing law relating to the expenditure of Federal-aid funds and may be difficult to administer. It is recommended, therefore, that said proviso be stricken from the bill and new language inserted in lieu thereof, as follows:

"Provided, That such funds shall be deemed to be expended upon execution of formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the improvement of specific projects under this section."

Under section 2 (c), apportioned interstate funds unexpended at the end of the period during which they would be available would be reapportioned to all the States. This provision would be at variance with the existing provisions of Federal-aid law relating to other apportioned funds which lapse if not expended during the period for which they are available. Accordingly, it is recommended that section 2 (c) be amended by striking therefrom in lines 19 to 22, page 5, the words "be reapportioned within sixty days thereafter to all the States on the same basis as if it were being apportioned under this section for the first time", and inserting in lieu thereof the word "lapse."

Under the first proviso in section 3, forest highway funds authorized but unobligated on June 30, 1955, would be canceled as of that date. As a provision with such date of cancellation would be difficult to administer and would have an inequitable effect upon the various States, it is recommended that the proviso be amended by striking from lines 4 through 6, page 6, the words "*Provided, That any sums heretofore authorized unobligated on June 30, 1955, shall be canceled as of June 30, 1955*", and inserting in lieu thereof "*Provided, That the authorization in section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 for forest highways for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, is hereby canceled*;"

Section 6 of the bill would provide additional authorizations for the purpose of carrying out section 1 of the act approved December 26, 1941, relating to the Inter-American Highway. To make it clear that section 2 of that act, which section provides that the survey and construction work shall be administered by the Bureau of Public Roads, remains in effect, it is recommended that the words "of section 1", lines 13 and 14, page 8, be stricken from the bill.

Section 1 would authorize the use of urban funds for projects on approved extensions of the Federal-aid secondary system within urban areas. In order that it will be made clear that the Secretary of Commerce may approve as part of the Federal-aid secondary system, extensions of such system through urban areas, it is recommended that the new language be inserted after section 11 of the bill, as follows:

"The Secretary of Commerce may approve as a part of the Federal-aid secondary system, extensions through urban areas, connecting points on that system, provided that Federal participation in projects on such extensions shall be limited to urban funds."

Since its original enactment in 1916, the Federal-aid highway legislation has been frequently amended and supplemented throughout the years, and it is believed advisable that the whole body of Federal-aid highway legislation be re-drafted into a one-package law, to include such changes or new provisions as would provide a modernized Federal highway law. As a step toward such objective it is recommended that section 12 of the bill be renumbered as section 13, and that a new section 12 be added to the bill, to read as follows:

"SEC. 12. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to transmit to the Congress not later than December 31, 1954, a suggested bill or bills for a Federal Highway Act, which will include such provisions of existing law, and such changed or new provisions as the Secretary deems advisable. The Secretary shall also submit a report commenting on the bill or bills, which shall include specific reference to each change in, or omission of, any provision of existing law."

The Bureau of Public Roads favors the enactment of H. R. 7818 subject to the amendments recommended above.

There are now pending before the committee several bills to provide additional Federal-aid authorizations in varying amounts for different fiscal years. These bills are as follows: H. R. 14, H. R. 1407, H. R. 3528, H. R. 3529, H. R. 7207, H. R. 7124, and H. R. 7678. Analyses of these bills showing a comparison with the provisions of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1952 are also attached. It is considered unnecessary to comment further with respect to these pending bills.

F. V. DU PONT,
Commissioner of Public Roads.

FEBRUARY 12, 1954.

COMPARISON OF 1952 FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT WITH H. R. 7818 (M'GREGOR)

1952 HIGHWAY ACT

Section 1. Federal-aid system

Provides total of \$550 million of contract authorization annually for fiscal 1954 and 1955, divided as follows:

\$247.5 million for the primary system;

\$165 million for the secondary system; and

\$137.5 million for the primary system in urban areas.

Apportionment formula

Primary system: One-third area; one-third population; one-third rural road mileage.

Secondary system: Same as primary except that rural population figures used.

Primary system in urban areas: Based solely on population of urban areas.

H. R. 7818

Section 1. Federal-aid system

Provides total of \$600 million annually for fiscal 1956 and 1957, divided as follows:

\$270 million for the primary system;

\$180 million for the secondary system; and

\$150 million for the primary system in urban areas, *and for projects on approved extensions of the Federal-aid secondary system within urban areas.* (Italicized language is new.)

(Percentage distribution between systems is same as in 1952 act.)

Apportionment formula

No change.

1952 HIGHWAY ACT

H. R. 7818

Availability of funds

Two years beyond fiscal year for which authorized.

Availability of funds

No change.

NEW PROVISIONS

No provision in existing law for outright transfer of funds between systems. But if all roads under control of State, secondary funds may be used on primary system if State and Commissioner jointly agree (sec. 3 of 1944 act).

Section 2. Interstate system

Provides \$25 million of contract authorization annually for fiscal 1954 and 1955.

Interstate funds now apportioned in same manner as primary funds.

Interstate funds now available for 2 years beyond fiscal year for which authorized.

Section 3. Forest highways and forest development roads and trails

Provides \$22.5 million of contract authorization annually for 1954 and 1955 for forest highways. Authorizes appropriations of \$22.5 million annually for 1954 and 1955 for forest development roads and trails.

1. Secretary of Commerce shall be deemed to have discharged his responsibility relative to plans, design, inspection, and construction of secondary projects upon receipt and approval of certified statement by State that project conforms with State's approved standards and procedures.

2. Up to 25 percent of a State's apportionment for any of above 3 systems may be transferred to another, but the net effect of such transfers shall not increase any system's apportionment by more than 25 percent. Transfers must be requested by State and approved by Secretary of Commerce as being in public interest. This would not impair proviso in section 3 of 1944 act regarding use of secondary funds on primary system where all highways are under control of State.

Section 2. Interstate system

Provides \$200 million annually for fiscal 1956 and 1957.

Federal share payable on account of any project to be determined in same manner as now provided by law for projects on primary system (no change in existing law).

NEW PROVISIONS

1. Interstate funds would be apportioned: One-half on basis of population; and one-half as now provided by law for primary funds.

2. Apportionment of interstate funds shall not be made unless a Federal gasoline tax of at least 2 cents is in effect at time of apportionment.

3. Interstate funds shall be available only for 6 months beyond fiscal year for which authorized. Funds shall be deemed to be expended at such times as the Secretary of Commerce determines that the State has actually incurred contractual obligations for performance of specific projects.

4. Balances remaining unobligated at the end of the 6 months' period to be reapportioned to all the States.

Section 3. Forest highways and forest development roads and trails

Continues for 1956 and 1957 the level authorized in 1952 act for both programs.

NEW PROVISION

Any unobligated balances of prior-year forest highway authorizations re-

1952 HIGHWAY ACT

H. R. 7818

maining on June 30, 1955, are to be canceled.

Section 4. Park roads and trails; parkways; and Indian roads

Authorizes appropriations of \$10 million annually for 1954 and 1955 for each of these 3 programs.

Section 4. Park roads and trails; parkways; and Indian roads

Continues for 1956 and 1957 the levels authorized in the 1952 act for each program.

NEW PROVISION

The Secretary of Commerce is designated, instead of the Commissioner of Public Roads as heretofore, with respect to the approval of the location, type, and design of Indian roads and with respect to supervision of construction.

Section 5. Rama Road, Nicaragua

Authorizes appropriations of \$2 million annually for 1953 and 1954 (appropriations under this authorization to be made to the Department of Commerce).

Section 5. Rama Road, Nicaragua

Authorizes to be appropriated not to exceed \$4 million to complete the road. Survey and construction work to be under general supervision of the Secretary of Commerce.

NEW PROVISION

Appropriations to be made directly to Secretary of State.

Section 6. Inter-American Highway

Authorizes appropriations of \$8 million annually for 1953 and 1954 (appropriations under this authorization to be made to the Department of Commerce).

Section 6. Inter-American Highway

Authorizes appropriations of \$8 million annually for fiscal 1955 and 1956.

NEW PROVISION

Appropriations to be made directly to Secretary of State.

Section 7. Emergency fund

Authorizes \$10 million annually for repair of Federal-aid highways or bridges damaged by floods or other catastrophes. This authorization is permanent.

Emergency fund

New authorization unnecessary.

Section 8. Public lands highways

Authorizes appropriations of \$2.5 million annually for 1954 and 1955 for roads through certain federally owned lands.

Public lands highways

No new authorization.

Section 9. President's Highway Safety Conference

Authorizes Commissioner of Public Roads, in cooperation with State highway departments, to assist in carrying out the program of the President's Highway Safety Conference. Provides not to exceed \$150,000 annually for this purpose.

President's Highway Safety Conference

No new authorization.

Section 10. Defense access roads

Authorizes an additional appropriation of \$50 million, to remain available until expended, for construction of access roads to defense plants and military installations and construction of circumferential highways (a total of \$95 million has been authorized to date).

Defense access roads

No new authorization.

1952 HIGHWAY ACT

H. R. 7813

Sections 11, 12, 13, and 14.—Miscellaneous provisions, including saving clause

Sections 7, 8, 9, and 12. Miscellaneous provisions, including saving clause

Necessary date changes made and new citations inserted.

Section 10. Study and report on problems of public utilities relocation

The Secretary of Commerce, in cooperation with State highway departments, is directed to study problems of public utilities relocation resulting from Federal-aid highway improvements, and to prepare a report to President for transmittal to Congress by April 1, 1955. (New provision.)

Section 8 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 reads as follows:

"With the approval of the Federal Works Administrator (now Secretary of Commerce), not to exceed 1½ per centum of the amount apportioned for any year to any State under the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, except sections 3 and 23 thereof, shall hereafter be used with or without State funds for surveys, plans, engineering, and economic investigations of projects for future construction in such State, on the Federal-aid highway system and extensions thereof within municipalities, on secondary or feeder roads, urban highways or grade-crossing eliminations, and for highway research necessary in connection therewith."

Section 11. Toll-road research

Would amend section 8 of the 1944 act to permit States to use, within the 1½-percent limitation, Federal-aid funds for surveys, plans, engineering, and economic investigations pertaining to toll roads and for research in connection therewith. (New provision.)

COMPARISON OF 1952 FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT WITH H. R. 14
(DEMPSEY)

1952 HIGHWAY ACT

H. R. 14

Section 2. Interstate system

Provides \$25 million of contract authorization annually for fiscal 1954 and 1955.

Interstate system

Would increase from \$25 million to \$225 million the contract authorization annually for fiscal 1954 and 1955. No other new provisions.

H. R. 14 identical to H. R. 1407.

COMPARISON OF 1952 FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT WITH H. R. 1407
(PATTEN)

1952 HIGHWAY ACT

H. R. 1407

Section 2. Interstate system

Provides \$25 million of contract authorization annually for fiscal 1954 and 1955.

Interstate system

Would increase from \$25 million to \$225 million the contract authorization annually for fiscal 1954 and 1955. No other new provisions.

H. R. 1407 identical to H. R. 14.

COMPARISON OF 1952 FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT WITH H. R. 3528
(DONDERO)

1952 HIGHWAY ACT

H. R. 3528

Section 2. Interstate system

Provides \$25 million of contract authorization annually for fiscal 1954 and 1955.

Interstate system

Would increase from \$25 million to \$275 million the contract authorization annually for fiscal 1954 and 1955. No other new provisions.

H. R. 3528 identical to H. R. 3529.

Commerce report on H. R. 3528 submitted to committee October 23, 1953. Report recommended that action on bill be deferred.

COMPARISON OF 1952 FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT WITH H. R. 3529
(OAKMAN)

1952 HIGHWAY ACT

H. R. 3529

Section 2. Interstate system

Provides \$25 million of contract authorization annually for fiscal 1954 and 1955.

Interstate system

Would increase from \$25 million to \$275 million the contract authorization annually for fiscal 1954 and 1955. No other new provisions.

H. R. 3529 identical to H. R. 3528.

Commerce report on H. R. 3528 submitted to committee on October 23, 1953. Report recommended that action on bill be deferred.

COMPARISON OF 1952 FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT WITH H. R. 7124 (MACK)

1952 HIGHWAY ACT

H. R. 7124

Section 1. Federal-aid system

Provides total of \$550 million of contract authorization annually for fiscal 1954 and 1955, divided as follows:

\$247.5 million for the primary system;

\$165 million for the secondary system; and

\$137.5 million for the primary system in urban areas.

Section 1. Federal-aid system

Would increase the total contract authorization for fiscal 1955 only, to \$825 million, divided as follows:

\$371¼ million for the primary system;

\$247.5 million for the secondary system;

\$206¼ million for the primary system in urban areas.

No other new provisions. Percentage distribution between systems same as in 1952 act.

Section 2. Interstate system

Provides \$25 million of contract authorization annually for fiscal 1954 and 1955.

Section 2. Interstate system

Would increase the contract authorization for fiscal 1955 only, to \$37.5 million.

No other new provisions.

H. R. 7124 (Mack) identical to H. R. 7207 (Scudder).

10. AMEND AND SUPPLEMENT THE FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT

COMPARISON OF 1952 FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT WITH H. R. 7207 (SCUDDER)

1952 HIGHWAY ACT

Section 1. Federal-aid system

Provides total of \$550 million of contract authorization annually for fiscal 1954 and 1955, divided as follows:

\$247.5 million for the primary system;
\$165 million for the secondary system; and
\$137.5 million for the primary system in urban areas.

Section 2. Interstate system

Provides \$25 million of contract authorization annually for fiscal 1954 and 1955.

H. R. 7207

Section 1. Federal-aid system

Would increase the total contract authorization for fiscal 1955 only, to \$825 million, divided as follows:

\$371¼ million for the primary system;
\$247.5 million for the secondary system; and
\$206¼ million for the primary system in urban areas.

No other new provisions. Percentage distribution between systems same as in 1952 act.

Section 2. Interstate system

Would increase the contract authorization for fiscal 1955 only, to \$37.5 million.

No other new provisions.

H. R. 7207 (Scudder) identical to H. R. 7124 (Mack).

COMPARISON OF 1952 FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT WITH H. R. 7678 (WATTS)

1952 HIGHWAY ACT

Section 1. Federal-aid system

Provides total of \$550 million of contract authorization annually for fiscal 1954 and 1955, divided as follows:

\$247.5 million for the primary system;
\$165 million for the secondary system; and
\$137.5 million for the primary system in urban areas.

Section 2. Interstate system

Provides \$25 million of contract authorization annually for fiscal 1954 and 1955.

H. R. 7678

Section 1 (a). Federal-aid system

Provides total of \$650 million annually for fiscal 1956 and 1957, divided as follows:

\$292.5 million for the primary system;
\$195 million for the secondary system; and
\$162.5 million for the primary system in urban areas.

(Percentage distribution between systems is same as in 1952 act.)

Section 1 (b). Interstate system

Provides \$150 million annually for fiscal 1956 and 1957.

NEW PROVISION

Federal share from interstate funds is same as for projects on primary system (not to exceed 50 percent plus sliding scale in public lands States).

Federal share from interstate funds not to exceed 75 percent of cost of construction and right-of-way.

Apportionment formula: (Sec. 4, 1944 act)

Primary system: One-third area; one-third population; one-third rural road mileage.

Secondary system: Same as primary except that rural population figures used.

Primary system in urban areas: Based solely on population of urban areas.

Interstate system: Same as primary.

Section 1 (c). Apportionment formula

Apportionment formula for all Federal-aid funds same as now provided by law.

1952 HIGHWAY ACT

H. R. 7678

Section 1 (d). Transfer of funds

NEW PROVISION

No provision in existing law for outright transfer of funds between systems. But if all roads under control of State, secondary funds may be used on primary system if State and Commissioner jointly agree (see. 3 of 1944 act).

Up to 20 percent of amounts authorized under subsections (a) and (b) may be transferred to another system. Transfers must be requested by State highway department, certified as being in the public interests, and approved by the Secretary of Commerce.

Section 1 (e). Availability of funds

Funds available for 2 years beyond fiscal year for which authorized (see. 1 of 1952 act).

Same as in section 1 of the 1952 Act.

Section 3. Forest highways and forest development roads and trails

Provides \$22.5 million of contract authorization annually for 1954 and 1955 for forest highways. Authorizes appropriations of \$22.5 million annually for 1954 and 1955 for forest development roads and trails.

Section 2. Forest highways and forest development roads and trails

Provides \$24 million of contract authorization annually for 1956 and 1957 for forest highways. Authorizes appropriations of \$24 million annually for 1956 and 1957 for forest development roads and trails.

Apportionment of Forest Highway Funds

Apportionment of such funds is to be made by Secretary of Commerce.

Apportionment of Forest Highway Funds

Would change existing law by having such apportionment made by Commissioner of Public Roads.

Section 4. Park roads and trails; parkways; and Indian roads

Authorizes appropriations of \$10 million annually for 1954 and 1955 for each of these programs.

Section 3. Park roads and trails; parkways; and Indian roads

Authorizes appropriations of \$11 million annually for 1956 and 1957 for each of these programs.

Section 5. Rama Road, Nicaragua

Authorizes appropriations of \$2 million annually for 1953 and 1954.

Rama Road, Nicaragua

No new authorization.

Section 6. Inter-American Highway

Authorizes appropriations of \$8 million annually for 1953 and 1954.

Inter-American Highway

No new authorization.

Section 7. Emergency fund

Authorizes \$10 million annually for repair of Federal-aid highways or bridges damaged by floods or other catastrophes. This authorization is permanent.

Section 4. Emergency fund

Authorizes \$11 million annually for repair of Federal-aid highways or bridges damaged by floods or other catastrophes. Federal share payable on interstate system not to exceed 75 percent.

Section 8. Public lands highways

Authorizes appropriations of \$2.5 million annually for 1954 and 1955 for roads through certain federally owned lands.

Section 5. Public lands highways

Authorizes appropriations of \$2¼ million annually for 1956 and 1957 for roads through certain federally owned lands.

Section 9. President's Highway Safety Conference

Authorizes Commissioner of Public Roads, in cooperation with State highway departments, to assist in carrying out the program of the President's Highway Safety Conference. Provides not to exceed \$150,000 annually for this purpose.

Section 6. President's Highway Safety Conference

Same provision as in 1952 act but would increase annual amount available for such purpose to \$200,000.

1952 HIGHWAY ACT

H. R. 7678

Section 10. Defense access roads

Authorizes an additional appropriation of \$50 million, to remain available until expended, for construction of access roads to defense plants and military installations and construction of circumferential highways (a total of \$95 million has been authorized to date).

Sections 11, 12, 13, and 14. Miscellaneous provisions, including saving clause

Section 7. Defense access roads

Would authorize a further appropriation of \$50 million for such purposes.

Sections 8, 9, 10, and 11. Miscellaneous provisions, including saving clause

Necessary date changes made, and new citations inserted.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington 25, D. C., February 12, 1954.

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
House of Representatives, Washington 25, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DONDERO: This responds to your request of February 10, for our comments on H. R. 7818, a bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

We favor the enactment of this bill so far as it affects the Department of the Interior.

This Department is primarily interested in section 4 of the bill which, if enacted, would authorize the appropriation of \$10 million annually for fiscal years 1956 and 1957 for each of the following three purposes: (a) the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails in areas administered by the National Park Service; (b) the construction, reconstruction, improvement and maintenance of parkways, authorized by acts of Congress, on lands owned by the United States; and (c) the construction, improvement, and maintenance of Indian reservation roads and bridges and roads and bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian lands under the provisions of the act of May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 750).

The proposed authorizations in section 4 are satisfactory to this Department. Representatives of the Department will be prepared to testify at the hearing on H. R. 7818 in support of section 4 of the bill.

Since I am informed that there is a particular urgency for the submission of the views of the Department, this report has not been cleared through the Bureau of the Budget and, therefore, no commitment can be made concerning the relationship of the views expressed herein to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH A. TUDOR,
Under Secretary of the Interior.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington 25, D. C., February 26, 1954.

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. DONDERO: The report of this Department on H. R. 7818, a bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes," was transmitted to your committee on February 12. In view of information that your

committee desired an immediate statement of the views of this Department, the report was submitted without clearance through the Bureau of the Budget.

Subsequent to the transmission of the report on H. R. 7818, we have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that the views expressed in that report, as submitted to your committee on February 12, are without objection insofar as the Bureau of the Budget is concerned.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS MCKAY,
Secretary of the Interior.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 16, 1954.

The Honorable GEORGE A. DONDERO,
*Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
House of Representatives.*

MY DEAR MR. DONDERO: In your letter of February 10, 1954, which transmitted a copy of H. R. 7818—a bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act—the comments of the Department of State were requested on the merits of the sections in it relating to the authorizations of funds for the Inter-American Highway, and the Rama Road in Nicaragua.

At the outset, this Department wishes to state its firm, unequivocal support of congressional action which will provide funds for the eventual completion of the Inter-American Highway and the Rama Road.

The question has arisen whether further authorizations of funds for the Inter-American Highway and the Rama Road as proposed in H. R. 7818 are necessary at this time. While additional authorizations are desirable in order to show the intent of the Congress to complete these roads, they are not requested provided the previous authorizations set forth in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 remain valid or are extended so that the funds may properly be appropriated in fiscal years 1955 and 1956.

It should be recalled that the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 (Public Law 413, 82d Cong.) provided for continuing the work on the Inter-American Highway with authorizations of \$8 million for each of the fiscal years 1953 and 1954. Likewise, \$2 million for each of the same fiscal years were authorized for the continued construction of the Rama Road. However, of the total funds authorized to be appropriated by the Congress only \$1 million has thus far been appropriated for the Inter-American Highway, and a similar amount for the Rama Road. There remain available for appropriation \$15 million for the Inter-American Highway, and \$3 million for the Rama Road. On January 14, before a subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, this Department vigorously supported the appropriation of \$1 million for the Inter-American Highway, and \$1 million for the Rama Road to the Department of Commerce in its regular budget for the fiscal year 1955 so that additional work toward completing the roads could be carried on.

The appropriation of funds for the highway construction on the basis of the funds authorized and extended, rather than additional authorizations, is needed now. The Department of State trusts that the Congress will consider seriously future action in that regard.

With respect to the change in the language of sections 5 and 6 of H. R. 7818 authorizing the money to be appropriated to the Department of State instead of to the Department of Commerce, the Department of State considers that it is the proper agency to provide the necessary political guidance with the nations of Central America concerned in the construction work. It will, as it has in the past, support the programs before the appropriate committees of Congress, and it will negotiate the necessary overall agreements with the foreign governments in accordance with the regulations prescribed by the Congress for the use of the funds. It agrees that the Bureau of Public Roads of the Department of Commerce is the proper agency to supervise the technical details of the cooperative constructions. It does not, however, consider that it is within its competence to determine which is the proper agency of the Government to receive the authorizations and seek the appropriation of the necessary funds to complete the construction work.

In order that the views of the Department of State may reach the committee promptly as requested, this report has not been cleared with the Bureau of the Budget, to which copies are being sent.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Acting Secretary of State).

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., February 12, 1954.

Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO,
*Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. DONDERO: This in reply to your request of February 10, 1954, for a report on H. R. 7818, a bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes. This Department, which administers the national forests, is directly concerned with section 3.

This section would authorize appropriations of \$22.5 million for each of fiscal years 1956 and 1957 for forest highways with the proviso that sums heretofore authorized unobligated at the close of fiscal year 1955 be canceled. Section 3 would also authorize like amounts for forest-development roads and trails with the proviso that advisory public hearings be held prior to construction or reconstruction of a timber-access road.

Forest highways are sections of Federal, State, and other important public highways which cross the national forests. Nearly all of these roads are on the State and county systems. The forest-highway funds are administered by the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, which is assisted by this Department and the respective States in formulating the forest-highway program.

Forest highways furnish the means of access to and outlet from the forest-development road system. They are used to haul many of the products of the forests to mills and markets as well as for general public travel and by persons visiting the national forests for recreation and other purposes. The need for improvement of the forest-highway system is urgent, and this Department endorses the authorizations proposed in H. R. 7818.

Forest-development roads and trails are of primary importance for the protection, administration, and utilization of the national forests. They are a responsibility of this Department.

The existing forest-development system consists of about 117,000 miles of roads and 121,000 miles of trails. The principal operations connected with the system are:

- (1) maintenance of existing roads and trails;
- (2) bridge construction and replacement;
- (3) advance surveys; and the design and engineering supervision for roads to be built by timber purchasers;
- (4) construction and reconstruction of general purpose and fire roads;
- (5) timber access roads.

The Department maintains about 80,000 miles of the roads on the system and 119,500 miles of the trails at a cost of about \$8.6 million annually. The balance of the roads and trails on the system are maintained by counties, timber purchasers, and others at their own expense.

There are 7,500 road and trail bridges on the forest-development system which were constructed of inferior materials in the 1930's and under emergency programs during the 1930's and World War II. These bridges are rapidly approaching the end of their useful life, and about \$3,200,000 is required each year for replacement of those which have become unsafe for further use.

About \$1,200,000 is required each year for advance surveys, and the design and engineering supervision on roads which are built by purchasers of national-forest timber under the terms of sales contracts.

The construction and reconstruction of critically needed roads and trails for fire protection, general administration, and the utilization of national-forest resources other than timber requires expenditures of about \$1,700,000 annually.

A major need is the construction and reconstruction of timber-access roads. To increase timber cutting on the national forests to sustained-yield capacity would require a Federal expenditure of \$94.3 million for main-line roads over a period of years. An approximately equal amount should be expended on access roads by purchasers of national-forest timber.

In fiscal year 1953 the national-forest timber cut was about 1.5 billion feet below the allowable cutting capacity. In that year the loss to the Federal Government through inability to market mature timber was about \$20 million in potential gross revenue. Losses of this character will continue from year to year until the major part of the access-road system has been installed. These losses cannot be recovered after the roads are built because they occur primarily in stands of old-growth timber. Because of the age and condition of this timber, losses from

disease, insects, windfall and fire each year just about balance the relatively small amount of growth which occurs on these old trees. This valuable timber should be harvested in an orderly way, and the land on which it is standing should be conditioned to produce future growth through regeneration to young and vigorous timber.

There are two sources of funds for the forest-development road and trail system: (1) The appropriation for forest-development roads and trails authorized for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218), as amended and supplemented; and (2) the appropriation for roads and trails for States, national forests fund (37 Stat. 843) which now amounts to about \$7,500,000 annually.

If the entire proposed annual authorization for forest-development roads and trails in H. R. 7818 is appropriated, the total funds available in each of fiscal years 1956 and 1957 will be \$30 million (\$22.5 million plus \$7.5 million). This would enable the Department to perform essential maintenance work on the forest-development system, make orderly progress on the bridge-replacement program, adequately plan and supervise the construction and reconstruction of development roads by timber purchasers, and build the urgently needed roads and trails required for fire protection and utilization of resources other than timber. After allowance is made for annual expenditures of approximately \$14.7 million for these purposes, \$15.3 million would be available annually for the construction of main-line timber-access roads.

Following is a summary of estimated annual expenditures for forest-development roads and trails if the full amount authorized in H. R. 7818 is appropriated:

<i>Item</i>	<i>Million dollars</i>
Maintenance.....	8.6
Bridge construction and replacement.....	3.2
Advance surveys; design and engineering of operator roads.....	1.2
Construction and reconstruction, fire and general-purpose roads.....	1.7
Timber-access roads.....	15.3
Total.....	30.0

The utility and safety of the forest-road system would be improved if funds provided for development roads and trails could be used for construction and maintenance of necessary parking areas. These are needed for more efficient administration of the national forests and for the safety of road users.

The Department therefore recommends enactment of section 3, and its amendment as follows:

In item (2), line 16, page 6, after the colon following the word "reconstruction" insert "Provided further, That hereafter funds available for forest-development roads and trails shall also be available for vehicular parking areas:".

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

E. T. BENSON, *Secretary.*

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., February 14, 1954.

Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This will acknowledge your letter of February 10, 1954, inviting the Bureau of the Budget to comment on H. R. 7818, a bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended, and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

The need for increasing and strengthening our highway programs in order to overcome existing deficiencies and to keep pace with the steadily increasing traffic demands is well recognized, and will be presented in other agency reports and in testimony before your committee. In his state of the Union message on January 7, the President set forth the position of the administration regarding immediate needs for highway legislation as follows:

"To protect the vital interest of every citizen in a safe and adequate highway system, the Federal Government is continuing its central role in the Federal-aid

highway program. So that maximum progress can be made to overcome present inadequacies in the interstate highway system, we must continue the Federal gasoline tax at 2 cents per gallon. This will require cancellation of the one-half cent decrease which otherwise will become effective April 1, and will maintain revenues so that an expanded highway program can be undertaken."

With respect to the longer range aspects of Federal-State cooperation in this field the President said:

"When the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations completes its study of the present system of financing highway construction, I shall promptly submit it for consideration by the Congress and the governors of the States."

H. R. 7818 would accomplish the highway objectives of the administration through the fiscal year 1957. The bill does this first by making the necessary 2-year extension of basic authorities and, secondly, by incorporating several provisions designed to increase the flexibility of the traditional Federal-aid program. It is our belief that the bill will also encourage a rapid acceleration in highway construction on the national system of interstate highways. Taken all together, these provisions will permit highway programs to be directed toward projects of highest priority both to the States and to the Nation.

In view of the critical deficiencies of the national system of interstate highways, the amount of \$200 million annually authorized under section 2 of the bill is clearly required. At the same time, this increase over the existing level represents a substantial additional fiscal commitment. It is vitally important, therefore, that the Federal gasoline tax be continued at its present level of 2 cents per gallon. The bill recognizes this necessity by providing that the increased authorization for the interstate system shall not become available unless the 2-cent Federal gasoline tax is in effect.

The bill continues the existing provision that the Federal and State Governments shall, in general, share equally the cost of projects on the national system of interstate highways. Proposals have been made from time to time, and are reflected in other bills before your committee, which would increase the Federal share. In our judgment, the effect of these proposals would be less highway construction than is possible under the traditional 50-50 matching ratio. In addition, since the national system of interstate highways is wholly included within the regular Federal-aid highway systems, we believe that the Federal Government and the States should continue as equal partners in programs for the improvement of our highway systems.

In connection with the bill as printed we wish to note and confirm our understanding of advice received from the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. McGregor, with respect to an agreed-upon change in the first proviso appearing on page 3. This change involves substituting for the words "shall be deemed to have discharged" appearing in line 5, the words "may discharge"; striking out the word "approved" in line 10; and inserting in line 12 after the word "category" the words "approved by him". The Bureau of the Budget supports this change. The purpose of the amended proviso is twofold, specifically to permit the States to have greater flexibility in the design and selection of secondary road projects and to obtain the most expeditious approval of such projects, provided that Federal approval is first given to the State standards and procedures under which secondary road funds will be spent.

We have been advised that questions have been raised as to why the authorities granted by the bill are vested in the Secretary of Commerce rather than in the Commissioner of Public Roads and whether this arrangement is appropriate. We believe that the bill is correctly drawn and would recommend strongly that it not be changed in this respect. The language follows one of the most important findings of the first Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, namely, that executive accountability is defeated when statutory authorities are vested in the subordinates of the heads of the executive departments. In consonance with that finding, Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1950 transferred the statutory functions of the Department of Commerce to the Secretary. Since the effective date of the reorganization plan the Secretary of Commerce has provided for the carrying out of the Federal-aid highway programs and functions through the Bureau of Public Roads and its head, the Commissioner of Public Roads. We assume that these existing delegations of authority will be continued in their present form.

Subject to the considerations set forth above, you are advised that the enactment of H. R. 7818 would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

ROWLAND HUGHES, *Deputy Director.*

The committee has considered seriously the statements of the witnesses and has adopted some of the amendments suggested by them and took no action on others. Witnesses representing the airlines testified regarding the segregation of revenue derived from the Federal excise tax on gasoline used by them. Consideration was given this subject; however, the committee decided that the matter would require special treatment; therefore, action thereon was deferred. The committee believes that H. R. 8127 contains the suggestions made by the departments and other persons, which would help in perfecting the Federal-aid highway program.

A brief section-by-section analysis of the bill is set forth below:

SECTION 1. FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY SYSTEM

Section 1 of the bill authorizes the appropriation of \$600 million for each of the fiscal years 1956 and 1957. Said annual sum would be available for expenditure as follows: \$270 million for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system; \$180 million for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system; and \$150 million for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system in urban areas, and for projects on approved extensions on the Federal-aid secondary system within urban areas. This division is on the same percentage basis as provided in the Federal-Aid Highway Acts of 1944, 1948, 1950, and 1952.

In arriving at the total authorization of \$600 million for the Federal-aid highway program, the committee took into consideration the authorization of \$550 million for each of the fiscal years 1954 and 1955 by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 and increased construction costs experienced since passage of the 1952 act.

The approximate amounts which each State would receive of the sums authorized by sections 1 and 2 of H. R. 8127 have been computed and are shown in the following tables:

TABLE A.—Approximate apportionment of Federal-aid highway funds pursuant to H. R. 8127

State	Federal-aid				Interstate		Total (\$800,000,000)
	Primary (\$270,000,000)	Secondary (\$180,000,000)	Urban (\$150,000,000)	Subtotal (\$600,000,000)	Population ¹ (\$100,000,000)	Sec. 21 ² (\$100,000,000)	
Alabama.....	\$5,761,000	\$4,465,000	\$1,938,000	\$12,164,000	\$1,876,000	\$2,155,000	\$16,195,000
Arizona.....	4,038,000	2,750,000	575,000	7,363,000	735,000	1,507,000	9,605,000
Arkansas.....	4,495,600	3,597,000	827,000	8,919,000	1,170,000	1,580,000	11,769,000
California.....	12,393,000	6,381,000	13,148,000	31,922,000	6,487,000	4,652,000	11,139,000
Colorado.....	4,838,000	3,245,000	1,229,000	9,332,000	812,000	1,814,000	2,626,000
Connecticut.....	1,751,000	882,000	2,864,000	5,497,000	1,230,000	658,000	11,958,000
Delaware.....	1,323,000	882,000	303,900	2,568,000	735,000	490,000	7,385,000
Florida.....	4,386,000	2,867,000	2,652,000	9,905,000	1,698,000	1,613,000	3,733,000
Georgia.....	5,103,000	2,103,000	2,156,000	13,941,000	2,111,000	2,498,000	13,246,000
Idaho.....	3,328,000	2,841,000	2,285,000	5,954,000	735,000	1,242,000	18,551,000
Illinois.....	10,401,000	5,664,000	10,344,000	26,409,000	5,339,000	3,901,000	7,931,000
Indiana.....	6,409,000	4,418,000	3,538,000	14,365,000	2,411,000	2,399,000	35,649,000
Iowa.....	6,520,000	4,772,000	1,756,000	13,048,000	1,606,000	2,436,000	19,175,000
Kansas.....	6,552,000	4,587,000	1,390,000	12,529,000	1,168,000	2,446,000	17,090,000
Kentucky.....	4,977,000	4,131,000	1,536,000	10,644,000	1,801,000	1,863,000	16,143,000
Louisiana.....	4,207,000	3,045,000	2,108,000	9,420,000	1,644,000	1,576,000	14,311,000
Maine.....	2,265,000	1,621,000	618,000	4,504,000	735,000	847,000	12,610,000
Massachusetts.....	2,374,000	1,451,000	2,510,000	6,335,000	1,436,000	892,000	6,086,000
Michigan.....	3,429,000	1,273,000	6,156,000	10,858,000	2,874,000	1,293,000	8,663,000
Minnesota.....	8,379,000	5,113,000	6,884,000	20,376,000	3,904,000	3,141,000	15,025,000
Mississippi.....	7,002,000	4,043,000	2,408,000	14,353,000	1,828,000	2,617,000	27,421,000
Missouri.....	4,826,000	4,021,000	819,000	9,666,000	1,335,000	1,894,000	18,798,000
Montana.....	7,870,000	5,325,000	3,643,000	16,838,000	2,423,000	2,943,000	12,805,000
Nebraska.....	5,243,000	3,730,000	348,000	9,501,000	735,000	2,023,000	22,204,000
Nevada.....	3,733,000	2,330,000	868,000	9,865,000	812,000	1,965,000	12,642,000
New Hampshire.....	3,486,000	2,882,000	113,000	5,929,000	735,000	1,300,000	7,964,000
New Jersey.....	1,323,000	882,000	438,000	2,643,000	735,000	1,400,000	3,868,000
New Mexico.....	3,491,000	1,175,000	6,475,000	11,141,000	2,963,000	1,316,000	15,420,000
New York.....	4,389,000	3,015,000	4,485,000	7,889,000	735,000	1,638,000	15,262,000
North Carolina.....	12,691,000	5,085,000	19,770,000	37,546,000	9,087,000	4,775,000	51,408,000
North Dakota.....	6,690,000	5,715,000	1,901,000	14,306,000	2,489,000	2,504,000	19,299,000
Ohio.....	3,917,000	2,844,000	250,000	7,011,000	735,000	1,461,000	9,207,000
Oklahoma.....	9,415,000	5,727,000	8,559,000	23,701,000	4,869,000	3,531,000	32,101,000
Oregon.....	5,778,000	4,137,000	1,616,000	11,531,000	1,369,000	2,159,000	15,059,000
Pennsylvania.....	4,616,000	3,226,000	1,186,000	9,028,000	932,000	1,725,000	11,686,000
Rhode Island.....	10,597,000	6,306,000	11,197,000	28,100,000	6,433,000	3,980,000	38,513,000
South Carolina.....	1,323,000	882,000	1,057,000	3,262,000	735,000	490,000	4,487,000
South Dakota.....	3,635,000	3,010,000	1,017,000	7,662,000	1,297,000	1,361,000	10,320,000
Tennessee.....	4,217,000	3,012,000	287,000	7,516,000	735,000	1,573,000	9,824,000
Texas.....	5,851,000	4,560,000	2,139,000	12,550,000	2,017,000	2,189,000	16,756,000
Utah.....	17,513,000	11,727,000	7,086,000	36,326,000	4,725,000	6,548,000	47,599,000
.....	3,104,000	2,053,000	627,000	5,784,000	735,000	1,159,000	7,678,000

Vermont.....	1,323,000	882,000	230,000	2,435,000	735,000	490,000	1,225,000	3,660,000
Virginia.....	5,128,000	3,986,000	2,306,000	11,420,000	2,034,000	1,920,000	3,954,000	15,374,000
Washington.....	4,463,000	2,982,000	2,232,000	9,677,000	1,438,000	1,670,000	3,128,000	12,805,000
West Virginia.....	2,944,000	2,563,000	963,000	6,470,000	1,229,000	1,103,000	2,332,000	8,802,000
Wisconsin.....	6,378,000	4,450,000	2,896,000	13,724,000	2,105,000	2,386,000	4,491,000	18,215,000
Wyoming.....	3,367,000	2,282,000	161,000	5,810,000	735,000	1,256,000	1,991,000	7,801,000
Hawaii.....	1,323,000	882,000	497,000	2,702,000	735,000	490,000	1,225,000	2,702,000
District of Columbia.....	1,323,000	882,000	1,278,000	3,483,000	735,000	490,000	1,225,000	4,708,000
Puerto Rico.....	1,402,000	1,465,000	1,271,000	4,138,000	735,000	490,000	1,225,000	4,138,000

¹ Apportioned according to total population with minimum of $\frac{3}{4}$ of 1 percent.

² Apportioned according to sec. 21 of Federal Highway Act, $\frac{1}{3}$ area, $\frac{1}{3}$ total population and $\frac{1}{3}$ post-road mileage, with minimum of $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 percent.

For purposes of comparison, the apportionment for the 1952 act was as follows:

TABLE B

State or Territory	Primary highway system (\$247,500,000)	Secondary or feeder roads (\$165,000,000)	Urban highways (\$137,500,000)	Interstate system (\$25,000,000)	Total
Alabama	\$5,217,552	\$4,013,898	\$1,758,127	\$532,314	\$11,551,891
Arizona	3,653,303	2,487,990	521,973	371,953	7,035,219
Arkansas	4,064,364	3,254,652	750,706	414,318	8,484,040
California	11,273,990	5,808,764	11,929,002	1,154,002	30,165,758
Colorado	4,402,051	2,910,172	1,115,307	448,362	8,905,895
Connecticut	1,571,238	800,250	2,598,965	161,200	5,131,653
Delaware	1,200,375	800,250	275,217	121,250	2,397,092
Florida	3,903,613	2,550,784	2,406,316	398,804	9,259,517
Georgia	6,059,367	4,627,705	1,955,727	618,094	13,260,893
Idaho	3,033,324	2,132,917	258,267	308,736	5,733,244
Illinois	9,415,818	5,124,593	9,381,933	963,234	24,888,578
Indiana	5,833,702	4,020,406	3,210,481	595,500	13,660,089
Iowa	5,915,625	4,328,851	1,593,160	602,769	12,440,405
Kansas	5,950,738	4,165,742	1,261,297	605,853	11,983,630
Kentucky	4,496,820	3,736,080	1,393,596	459,028	10,085,524
Louisiana	3,812,021	2,759,226	1,967,149	389,375	8,927,771
Maine	2,061,148	1,474,586	560,854	210,101	4,306,689
Maryland	2,151,491	1,314,877	2,277,511	220,394	5,961,303
Massachusetts	3,102,505	1,149,426	5,585,538	318,932	10,156,401
Michigan	7,594,942	4,633,662	6,245,790	776,456	19,250,850
Minnesota	6,444,508	4,545,371	2,185,224	656,907	13,832,010
Mississippi	4,357,237	3,632,971	742,978	444,235	9,177,421
Missouri	7,127,588	4,822,289	3,304,889	726,976	15,981,742
Montana	4,957,442	3,409,119	315,997	501,310	9,186,868
Nebraska	4,751,285	3,369,779	787,065	433,631	9,391,760
Nevada	3,174,465	2,121,392	102,203	322,835	5,720,895
New Hampshire	1,200,375	800,250	397,419	121,250	2,519,294
New Jersey	3,175,262	1,071,050	5,874,465	326,438	10,447,215
New Mexico	4,003,539	2,749,711	440,412	407,468	7,601,130
New York	11,527,309	4,622,354	17,937,120	1,182,803	35,269,586
North Carolina	6,048,757	5,170,669	1,724,427	617,527	13,561,380
North Dakota	3,562,057	2,585,761	226,915	362,325	6,737,058
Ohio	8,609,919	5,240,955	7,765,686	880,712	22,497,272
Oklahoma	5,245,994	3,755,923	1,466,130	534,576	11,002,623
Oregon	4,198,212	2,933,480	1,076,050	427,813	8,635,555
Pennsylvania	9,582,120	5,699,723	10,159,251	981,618	26,422,712
Rhode Island	1,200,375	800,250	959,321	121,250	3,081,196
South Carolina	3,291,443	2,726,238	923,122	335,960	7,276,763
South Dakota	3,827,991	2,733,672	260,648	389,370	7,211,681
Tennessee	5,293,910	4,127,446	1,940,548	540,208	11,902,112
Texas	15,842,002	10,607,168	6,428,891	1,615,515	34,493,576
Utah	2,824,094	1,868,149	568,628	287,607	5,548,478
Vermont	1,200,375	800,250	208,950	121,250	2,330,825
Virginia	4,645,445	3,611,080	2,092,640	474,439	10,823,604
Washington	4,064,587	2,715,106	2,024,855	414,845	9,219,393
West Virginia	2,678,927	2,330,488	873,369	273,683	6,156,467
Wisconsin	5,802,073	4,047,423	2,627,837	591,968	13,069,301
Wyoming	3,053,021	2,068,920	145,912	310,556	5,578,409
District of Columbia	1,200,375	800,250	1,159,334	121,250	3,281,209
Hawaii	1,200,375	800,250	451,260	-----	2,451,885
Puerto Rico	1,269,948	1,327,682	1,153,508	-----	3,751,138

The bill provides that the sums apportioned to each State under the provisions of section 1 shall be available for expenditure for 2 fiscal years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized and that any money so apportioned that remains unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse. It further provides that such sums shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums apportioned to the State for such fiscal year is covered by formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the improvement of specific projects. It, therefore, would follow that any money not expended within the period provided by the law would lapse and be covered into the Treasury. These provisions are identical with those concerning the period of availability of funds authorized by the Federal-Aid Highway Acts of 1948, 1950, and 1952. With respect to the language which the committee has approved in subsection (e),

the amount authorized thereunder may be applied for projects on approved extensions on the Federal-aid secondary system within urban areas provided that the Federal participation in such projects shall be limited to urban funds.

The second proviso of section 1 provides that the Secretary of Commerce may discharge his responsibility relative to the plans, design, inspection, and construction of secondary projects upon his receipt and approval of a certified statement by the State highway department setting forth that the plans, design, and construction for such projects are in accord with the State standards and procedures applicable to projects in this category approved by him. The purpose of this proviso is to give the Secretary discretionary powers with respect to secondary roads, and to permit State highway departments to take over to a substantial extent the responsibilities now exercised by the Secretary. This should reduce detailed administrative procedures and give the States greater latitude in connection with secondary roads. Heretofore, the Secretary has been required to exercise specific duties, prescribed particularly by the Federal Highway Act approved November 9, 1921, with respect to the various steps from approval of the secondary system and the filing of a project statement (now termed "program") to final payment. While the Secretary may thus relieve himself of many of his present duties, he still would have to approve the secondary system, and the States would still be subject to existing law with respect to maintenance. It is assumed that he would make such requirements as would be consonant with his responsibilities as the disbursing agent of large sums of money. Nevertheless, he would be entitled to rely fully on the statement or statements as to any facts contained therein, if such statement or statements are certified by the State highway department. These powers may be exercised as soon as the act becomes effective.

Section 1 modifies existing law and procedures with respect to transfer of Federal-aid highway funds. It would permit not exceeding 25 percent of the amount apportioned to any State in any year for expenditure on the Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban highway systems, respectively, to be transferred from the apportionment under one system to either of the others. Such transfer would be effective only when requested and certified by the State highway department as being in the public interest, and approved by the Secretary of Commerce. This new provision is designed in the interest of flexibility; however, the total of the transfers permitted shall not increase the original apportionment under any of the three systems by more than 25 percent. The transfers permitted herein will apply not only for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1956, and June 30, 1957, but also to the provisions of the 1952 Federal-Aid Highway Act.

SECTION 2. INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS

Section 2 (a) authorizes to be appropriated the additional sum of \$200 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like additional sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, for the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, and improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the national system of interstate highways, including extensions thereof through urban areas. The sum authorized for each fiscal year is to be apportioned

among the several States in the following manner: one-half in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, as shown by the latest available Federal census: *Provided*, That no State shall receive less than three-fourths of 1 percent of the money so apportioned; and one-half in the manner now provided by law for apportionment of funds for the Federal-aid primary system. The Federal share payable on account of any project on the national system of interstate highways provided for by funds made available under the provisions of this section shall be increased to 60 percent of the total cost thereof, plus a percentage of the remaining 40 percent of such cost in any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 percent of the total area of all lands therein, equal to the percentage that the area of such lands in such State is of its total area.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 provided for a 50-50 matching ratio. The committee in an effort to stimulate construction on the interstate highway system approved a 60 (Federal) to 40 (State) ratio for the 2 fiscal years provided for in this bill.

The Secretary of Commerce is not permitted to apportion to the States the sum authorized by this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, unless a Federal excise tax on gasoline in the amount of not less than 2 cents per gallon is in effect on September 30, 1954; and the Secretary of Commerce shall not apportion to the States the sum authorized by this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, unless a Federal excise tax on gasoline in the amount of not less than 2 cents per gallon is in effect on September 30, 1955.

The committee is aware of the fact that the highway users feel that all revenue from the Federal excise tax on gasoline should be expended for highway construction.

The availability of funds for the interstate highway system (\$200 million) depends, in a large measure, upon the continuation of the present 2-cent Federal excise tax on gasoline. The committee feels a high priority should be given to interstate highway construction, as is evidenced by the fact that the amount authorized for this system was increased from \$25 million in the 1952 act to \$200 million per year. The question of continuing the Federal excise tax on gasoline at 2 cents per gallon beyond April 1, 1954, is a matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Section 2 (b) provides that any sums apportioned to any State under the provisions of subsection (a) shall be available for expenditure in that State for 2 years after the close of fiscal year for which such sums are authorized and such funds shall be deemed to be expended upon execution of formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the improvement of specific projects under the section. This is the same grace period as is now provided with respect to Federal-aid primary and secondary funds.

Under subsection (c) any amount apportioned to the States under the provisions of section 2 unexpended at the end of the period during which it is available for expenditure under the terms of subsection (b) of the section shall lapse.

SECTION 3. FOREST HIGHWAYS AND FOREST DEVELOPMENT
ROADS AND TRAILS

Section 3 authorizes to be appropriated for forest highways the sum of \$22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957. The authorization in section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 for forest highways for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, is canceled. Section 3 also authorizes to be appropriated for forest development roads and trails the sum of \$22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

With respect to any proposed construction or reconstruction of a timber-access road, advisory public hearings shall be held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area of construction or reconstruction with notice and reasonable opportunity for interested persons to present their views as to the practicability and feasibility of such construction or reconstruction. Hereafter funds available for forest development roads and trails shall also be available for vehicular parking areas.

The appropriation authorized for forest highways is to be apportioned by the Secretary of Commerce for expenditure in the several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico in accordance with the provision of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950.

SECTION 4 (A). PARK ROADS AND TRAILS

Section 4 (a) provides an authorization of \$10 million for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1956 and 1957, for the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads, trails, and bridges in national parks and monuments and approach roads thereto, including areas authorized to be established as national parks and monuments. The sums authorized are the same in amount as were authorized by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 for the fiscal years 1954 and 1955.

SECTION 4 (B). PARKWAYS

Section 4 (b) would authorize the sum of \$10 million for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1956 and 1957, for the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of parkways over lands to which title is vested in the United States.

SECTION 4 (C). INDIAN ROADS

Section 4 (c) would authorize the sum of \$10 million for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1956 and 1957, for the construction, improvement, and maintenance of roads and bridges within Indian reservations and to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian lands. This sum is the same as was authorized for the same purpose by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 for the fiscal years 1954 and 1955.

SECTION 5. RAMA ROAD AND INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

Section 5 continues the authorizations of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 for the Rama Road and Inter-American Highway respectively, for the fiscal years 1955 and 1956. No additional funds are authorized.

Section 6 provides that all or part of the Federal-Aid Highway Acts specified not inconsistent with this act shall remain in full force and effect.

Section 7 is a saving provision to the effect that if any section, subsection, or other provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the validity of the remainder thereof.

Section 8 provides for the repeal of all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with this act and that this act shall take effect upon its passage.

SECTION 9. STUDY OF UTILITY RELOCATION

Section 9 provides that the Secretary of Commerce is directed to make a study in cooperation with the State highway departments and other parties in interest relative to the problems posed by necessary relocation and reconstruction of public utilities services resulting from authorized highway improvements. Among other things, such a study is to include a review and financial analysis of existing relationships between the State highway departments and affected utilities of all types, and a review of the various State statutes regulating existing relationships, to the end that a full and informative report may be made to the President for transmittal to the Congress of the United States not later than February 1, 1955.

Section 10 is a definition paragraph and provides that the term "highway," as defined in section 2 of the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921 (42 Stat. 212), as amended and supplemented, is to be deemed to include "tunnels."

SECTION 11. AUTHORIZATION FOR SECONDARY EXTENSIONS IN URBAN AREAS

Section 11 provides organic authority to the Secretary of Commerce to carry out the provisions of section 1 (c) of this act.

SECTION 12. GREAT RIVER ROAD

Section 12 authorizes to be expended by the Secretary of Commerce from general administrative funds not to exceed \$250,000 for the purpose of expediting the interstate planning and coordination of a continuous Great River Road and appurtenances thereto traversing the Mississippi Valley from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico in general conformity with the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and with the recommended plan set forth in the joint report submitted to the Congress November 28, 1951, by the Secretaries of Commerce and Interior pursuant to the act of August 24, 1949 (Public Law 262, 81st Cong.). The amount expended is to be apportioned among the 10 States bordering the Mississippi River in proportion to the amount allocated by these

respective States for the improvement and extension of existing sections of this highway project as approved by the Secretary of Commerce in cooperation with other public agencies concerned therewith.

Section 13 provides that this act may be cited as the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954."

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with paragraph 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law proposed by the bill are shown in parallel columns as follows:

EXISTING LAW

SECTION 1, FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1952

Any sums apportioned to any State under the provision of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for two years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized, and any amount so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse: *Provided*, That such funds for any fiscal year shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums apportioned to the State for such fiscal year is covered by formal agreements with the Commissioner of Public Roads for the improvement of specific projects as provided by this Act.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1944

(58 Stat. 838)

SEC. 3. * * * *Provided further*, That any of such funds for secondary and feeder roads which are apportioned to a State in which all public roads and highways are under the control and supervision of the State highway department may, if the State highway department and the Commissioner of Public Roads jointly agree that such funds are not needed for secondary and feeder roads, be expended for projects in such State on the Federal-aid highway system.

NEW LANGUAGE

SECTION 1 OF H. R. 8127

* * * Any sums apportioned to any State under the provision of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for two years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized, and any amount so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse: *Provided*, That such funds for any fiscal year shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums apportioned to the State for such fiscal year is covered by formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the improvement of specific projects as provided by this Act: *Provided further*, That in the case of those sums apportioned to any State for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system, the Secretary of Commerce may discharge his responsibility relative to the plans, design, inspection, and construction of such secondary road projects upon his receipt and approval of a certified statement by the State highway department setting forth that the plans, design, and construction for such projects are in accord with the standards and procedures of the respective States applicable to projects in this category approved by him:

* * * *Provided further*, That not more than 25 per centum of the amount apportioned to each State under subparagraphs (a), (b), or (c) of this section may be transferred from the apportionment under one subparagraph to the apportionment under either of the other subparagraphs: *Provided further*, That such transfer is requested by the State highway department and is approved by the Secretary of Commerce as being in the public interest: *Provided further*, That the total of such transfers shall

EXISTING LAW

NEW LANGUAGE

not increase the original apportionment under any subparagraph by more than 25 per centum: *Provided further*, That the transfers hereinabove permitted for funds authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1956, and June 30, 1957, shall likewise be permitted on the same basis for funds heretofore or hereafter authorized to be appropriated for any prior or subsequent fiscal year: *And provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be deemed to alter or impair the authority contained in the last proviso to subparagraph (b) of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944.

SECTION 2, FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY
ACT OF 1952

For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, and improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the national system of interstate highways, designated in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like additional sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955. The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided by law for the apportionment of Federal-aid primary funds: *Provided*, That the Federal share payable on account of any project provided for by funds made available under the provisions of this section shall be determined in the same manner as now provided by law for projects on said Federal-aid primary system.

SECTION 2 OF H. R. 8127

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, and improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the national system of interstate highways, including extensions thereof through urban areas, designated in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of \$200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like additional sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957. The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be apportioned among the several States in the following manner: one-half in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, as shown by the latest available Federal census: *Provided*, That no State shall receive less than three-fourths of 1 per centum of the money so apportioned; and one-half in the manner now provided by law for apportionment of funds for the Federal-Aid primary system: *Provided further*, That the Federal share payable on account of any project on the national system of interstate highways provided for by funds made available under the provisions of this section shall be increased to 60 per centum of the total cost thereof, plus a percentage of the remaining 40 per centum of such cost in any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and non-taxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 per centum of the total area of all lands therein, equal to the percentage that the area of such lands in such State is of its total area: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of

EXISTING LAW

NEW LANGUAGE

Commerce shall not apportion to the States the sum authorized by this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, unless a Federal excise tax on gasoline in the amount of not less than 2 cents per gallon is in effect on September 30, 1954; and the Secretary of Commerce shall not apportion to the States the sum authorized by this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, unless a Federal excise tax on gasoline in the amount of not less than 2 cents per gallon is in effect on September 30, 1955.

(b) Any sums apportioned to any State under the provisions of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for two years after the close of fiscal year for which such sums are authorized: *Provided*, That such funds shall be deemed to be expended upon execution of formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the improvement of specific projects under this section.

(c) Any amount apportioned to the States under the provisions of this section unexpended at the end of the period during which it is available for expenditure under the terms of subsection (b) of this section shall lapse.

SECTION 2, FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT
OF 1921

* * * The term "highway" includes rights of way, bridges, drainage structures, signs, guard rails, and protective structures in connection with highways, but shall not include any highway or street in a municipality having a population of two thousand five hundred or more as shown by the last available census, except that portion of any such highway or street along which within a distance of one mile the houses average more than two hundred feet apart.

SECTION 10 OF H. R. 8127

SEC. 10. The term "highway", as defined in section 2 of the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921 (42 Stat. 212), as amended and supplemented, shall be deemed to include "tunnels".



Union Calendar No. 488

83^D CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 8127

[Report No. 1308]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 1, 1954

Mr. MCGREGOR introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Public Works

MARCH 4, 1954

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

A BILL

To amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the
4 Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat.
5 355), and all Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary
6 thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the
7 sum of \$600,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,
8 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30,
9 1957.

1 The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be
2 available for expenditure as follows:

3 (a) \$270,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid pri-
4 mary highway system.

5 (b) \$180,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid sec-
6 ondary highway system.

7 (c) \$150,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid
8 primary highway system in urban areas, and for projects
9 on approved extensions of the Federal-aid secondary system
10 within urban areas.

11 The sums authorized by this section for each fiscal year,
12 respectively, shall be apportioned among the several States
13 in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with
14 the formulas set forth in section 4 of the Federal-Aid High-
15 way Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat.
16 838).

17 Any sums apportioned to any State under the provi-
18 sion of this section shall be available for expenditure in
19 that State for two years after the close of the fiscal year
20 for which such sums are authorized, and any amount so
21 apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period
22 shall lapse: *Provided*, That such funds for any fiscal year
23 shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to
24 the total of the sums apportioned to the State for such
25 fiscal year is covered by formal agreements with the Sec-

1 retary of Commerce for the improvement of specific projects
2 as provided by this Act: *Provided further*, That in the case
3 of those sums apportioned to any State for projects on the
4 Federal-aid secondary highway system, the Secretary of
5 commerce may discharge his responsibility relative to the
6 plans, design, inspection, and construction of such secondary
7 road projects upon his receipt and approval of a certified
8 statement by the State highway department setting forth
9 that the plans, design, and construction for such projects are
10 in accord with the standards and procedures of the respective
11 States applicable to projects in this category approved by
12 him: *Provided further*, That not more than 25 per centum
13 of the amount apportioned to each State under subpara-
14 graphs (a), (b), or (c) of this section may be transferred
15 from the apportionment under one subparagraph to the
16 apportionment under either of the other subparagraphs:
17 *Provided further*, That such transfer is requested by the
18 State highway department and is approved by the Secretary
19 of Commerce as being in the public interest: *Provided fur-*
20 *ther*, That the total of such transfers shall not increase
21 the original apportionment under any subparagraph by
22 more than 25 per centum: *Provided further*, that the trans-
23 fers hereinabove permitted for funds authorized to be appro-
24 priated for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1956, and
25 June 30, 1957, shall likewise be permitted on the same

1 basis for funds heretofore or hereafter authorized to be ap-
2 propriated for any prior or subsequent fiscal year: *And pro-*
3 *vided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be deemed
4 to alter or impair the authority contained in the last proviso
5 to subparagraph (b) of section 3 of the Federal-Aid High-
6 way Act of 1944.

7 SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of expediting the construc-
8 tion, reconstruction, and improvement, inclusive of necessary
9 bridges and tunnels, of the national system of interstate high-
10 ways, including extensions thereof through urban areas,
11 designated in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of
12 the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838),
13 there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional
14 sum of \$200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,
15 1956, and a like additional sum for the fiscal year ending
16 June 30, 1957. The sum herein authorized for each fiscal
17 year shall be apportioned among the several States in the
18 following manner: one-half in the ratio which the popula-
19 tion of each State bears to the total population of all the
20 States, as shown by the latest available Federal census:
21 *Provided*, That no State shall receive less than three-fourths
22 of 1 per centum of the money so apportioned; and one-half
23 in the manner now provided by law for apportionment of
24 funds for the Federal-Aid primary system: *Provided further*,

1 That the Federal share payable on account of any
2 project on the national system of interstate highways provided
3 for by funds made available under the provisions of this sec-
4 tion shall be increased to 60 per centum of the total cost
5 thereof, plus a percentage of the remaining 40 per centum of
6 such cost in any State containing unappropriated and unre-
7 served public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual
8 and tribal, exceeding 5 per centum of the total area of all
9 lands therein, equal to the percentage that the area of such
10 lands in such State is of its total area: Provided fur-
11 ther, That the Secretary of Commerce shall not ap-
12 portion to the States the sum authorized by this section
13 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, unless a Federal
14 excise tax on gasoline in the amount of not less than 2 cents
15 per gallon is in effect on September 30, 1954; and the Secre-
16 tary of Commerce shall not apportion to the States the sum
17 authorized by this section for the fiscal year ending June 30,
18 1957, unless a Federal excise tax on gasoline in the amount
19 of not less than 2 cents per gallon is in effect on September
20 30, 1955.

21 (b) Any sums apportioned to any State under the pro-
22 visions of this section shall be available for expenditure in
23 that State for two years after the close of fiscal year for which

1 such sums are authorized: *Provided*, That such funds shall be
2 deemed to be expended upon execution of formal agreements
3 with the Secretary of Commerce for the improvement of
4 specific projects under this section.

5 (c) Any amount apportioned to the States under the
6 provisions of this section unexpended at the end of the
7 period during which it is available for expenditure under
8 the terms of subsection (b) of this section shall lapse.

9 SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions
10 of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218),
11 as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized
12 to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of
13 \$22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and
14 a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957:
15 *Provided*, That the authorization in section 3 of the Federal-
16 Aid Highway Act of 1952 for forest highways for the fiscal
17 year ending June 30, 1955, is hereby canceled; and (2)
18 for forest development roads and trails the sum of \$22,500,-
19 000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like
20 sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957: *Provided*,
21 That with respect to any proposed construction or recon-
22 struction of a timber access road, advisory public hearings
23 shall be held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area
24 of construction or reconstruction with notice and reasonable

1 opportunity for interested persons to present their views
2 as to the practicability and feasibility of such construction
3 or reconstruction: *Provided further*, That hereafter funds
4 available for forest development roads and trails shall also
5 be available for vehicular parking areas: *Provided further*,
6 That the appropriation herein authorized for forest highways
7 shall be apportioned by the Secretary of Commerce for ex-
8 penditure in the several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico in
9 accordance with the provision of section 3 of the Federal-
10 Aid Highway Act of 1950.

11 SEC. 4. (a) For the construction, reconstruction, and
12 improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary
13 bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas ad-
14 ministered by the National Park Service, including areas
15 authorized to be established as national parks and monu-
16 ments, and national park and monument approach roads
17 authorized by the Act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat. 1053),
18 as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated
19 the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,
20 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30,
21 1957.

22 (b) For the construction, reconstruction, and improve-
23 ment of parkways, authorized by Acts of Congress, on lands
24 to which title is vested in the United States, there is hereby

1 authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for
2 the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for
3 the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

4 (c) For the construction, improvement, and mainte-
5 nance of Indian reservation roads and bridges and roads and
6 bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian
7 lands under the provisions of the Act approved May 26,
8 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be
9 appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year
10 ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year
11 ending June 30, 1957: *Provided*, That the location, type,
12 and design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be
13 approved by the Secretary of Commerce before any expendi-
14 tures are made thereon, and all such construction shall be
15 under the general supervision of the Secretary of Commerce.

16 SEC. 5. Any unappropriated balance of the sums hereto-
17 fore authorized to be appropriated by sections 5 and 6 of
18 the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 158), for
19 the Rama Road in Nicaragua and the Inter-American High-
20 way, respectively, for the fiscal years 1953 and 1954, shall
21 continue to be authorized to be appropriated for such purposes
22 for the fiscal years 1955 and 1956.

23 SEC. 6. All provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act
24 of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838); the

1 Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, approved June 29, 1948
2 (62 Stat. 1105) ; and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950,
3 approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785) ; and the
4 Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952, approved June 25, 1952
5 (66 Stat. 158), not inconsistent with this Act, shall remain
6 in full force and effect.

7 SEC. 7. If any section, subsection, or other provision of
8 this Act or the application thereof to any person or circum-
9 stance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act and the
10 application of such section, subsection, or other provision to
11 other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

12 SEC. 8. All Acts or parts of Acts in any way inconsis-
13 tent with the provisions of this Act are hereby repealed, and
14 this Act shall take effect on its passage.

15 SEC. 9. The Secretary of Commerce is hereby directed
16 to make a study in cooperation with the State highway
17 departments and other parties in interest relative to the prob-
18 lems posed by necessary relocation and reconstruction of
19 public utilities services resulting from highway improvements
20 authorized under this Act. Among other things, such a study
21 shall include a review and financial analysis of existing
22 relationships between the State highway departments and
23 affected utilities of all types, and a review of the various
24 State statutes regulating existing relationships, to the end

1 that a full and informative report may be made to the
2 President for transmittal to the Congress of the United States
3 not later than February 1, 1955.

4 SEC. 10. The term "highway", as defined in section 2
5 of the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921 (42 Stat.
6 212), as amended and supplemented, shall be deemed to
7 include "tunnels".

8 SEC. 11. The Secretary of Commerce may approve as
9 a part of the Federal-aid secondary system, extensions
10 through urban areas, connecting points on that system, pro-
11 vided that Federal participation in projects on such exten-
12 sions shall be limited to urban funds.

13 SEC. 12. For the purpose of expediting the interstate
14 planning and coordination of a continuous Great River Road
15 and appurtenances thereto traversing the Mississippi Valley
16 from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico in general conformity
17 with the provisions of the Federal Aid Road Act of July 11,
18 1916, as amended and supplemented, and with the recom-
19 mended plan set forth in the joint report submitted to the
20 Congress November 28, 1951, by the Secretaries of Com-
21 merce and Interior pursuant to the Act of August 24, 1949
22 (Public Law 262, Eighty-first Congress), there is hereby
23 authorized to be expended by the Secretary of Commerce
24 from general administrative funds not to exceed \$250,000;
25 the amount expended under this section shall be apportioned

1 among the ten States bordering the Mississippi River in pro-
2 portion to the amount allocated by these respective States for
3 the improvement and extension of existing sections of this
4 highway project as approved by the Secretary of Commerce
5 in cooperation with other public agencies concerned there-
6 with.

7 SEC. 13. This Act may be cited as the “Federal-Aid
8 Highway Act of 1954”.

83^d CONGRESS
2^d Session

H. R. 8127

[Report No. 1308]

A BILL

To amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

By Mr. Mcgregor

MARCH 1, 1954

Referred to the Committee on Public Works

MARCH 4, 1954

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

S. 3069

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 4 (legislative day, MARCH 1), 1954

Mr. FERGUSON introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Public Works

A BILL

To amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY SYSTEM

4 SECTION 1. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the
5 provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11,
6 1916 (39 Stat. 355), and all Acts amendatory thereof and
7 supplementary thereto, there is hereby authorized to be
8 appropriated the sum of \$1,125,000,000 for the fiscal year
9 ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year
10 ending June 30, 1957.

1 (b) The sum authorized by subsection (a) for each
2 fiscal year shall be available for expenditure as follows:

3 (1) \$425,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid
4 primary highway system.

5 (2) \$350,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid
6 secondary highway system.

7 (3) \$350,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid
8 primary highway system in urban areas, and for projects
9 on approved extensions of the Federal-aid secondary system
10 within urban areas.

11 (c) One-half of the sums authorized by this section for
12 each fiscal year, respectively, shall be apportioned among the
13 several States in the manner now provided by law and in
14 accordance with the formulas set forth in section 4 of the
15 Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20,
16 1944 (58 Stat. 838). The remaining one-half of such sums
17 for each fiscal year, respectively, shall be apportioned among
18 the several States in the ratio which the motor vehicle
19 registrations in each State as of June 30 of the year pre-
20 ceding the commencement of the fiscal year for which the
21 apportionment is being made, as determined by the Secretary
22 of Commerce, bears to the total of motor vehicle registrations
23 in all of the States as of such date, as determined by the
24 Secretary of Commerce.

25 (d) Any sums apportioned to any State under the pro-

visions of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for two years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized, and any amount so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse. The funds apportioned to any State for any fiscal year shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums apportioned to the State for such fiscal year is covered by formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the improvement of specific projects as provided by this Act. In the case of those sums apportioned to any State for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system, the Secretary of Commerce shall be deemed to have discharged his responsibility relative to the plans, design, inspection, and construction of such secondary road projects upon his receipt and approval of a certified statement by the State highway department setting forth that the plans, design, and construction for such projects are in accord with the approved standards and procedures of the respective States applicable to projects in this category.

(e) Not more than 25 per centum of the amount apportioned to each State under subsection (b) (1), (b) (2), or (b) (3) of this section may be transferred from the apportionment under such subsection to the apportionment under either of the other subsections. Any such transfer must be requested by the State highway department con-

cerned and approved by the Secretary of Commerce as being in the public interest. The total of such transfers shall not increase the original apportionment under any such subsection by more than 25 per centum. Nothing herein contained shall be deemed to alter or impair the authority contained in the last proviso to subparagraph (b) of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944. The transfers hereinabove permitted for funds authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1956, and June 30, 1957, shall likewise be permitted on the same basis for funds heretofore or hereafter authorized to be appropriated for any prior or subsequent fiscal year.

(f) The Secretary of Commerce may approve, as a part of the Federal-aid secondary system, extensions through urban areas connecting points on that system, except that Federal participation in projects on such extensions shall be limited to funds available for expenditures for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system in urban areas.

NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, and improvement, inclusive of necessary tunnels, of the national system of interstate highways, designated in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of

1 \$900,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and
2 a like additional sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

3 (b) One-half of the sum authorized by subsection (a)
4 for each fiscal year shall be apportioned among the several
5 States in the ratio which the motor vehicle registrations in
6 each State as of June 30 of the year preceding the com-
7 mencement of the fiscal year for which the apportionment
8 is being made, as determined by the Secretary of Commerce,
9 bears to the total of motor vehicle registrations in all of the
10 States as of such date, as determined by the Secretary of
11 Commerce. The remaining one-half of such sum shall be
12 apportioned in the manner now provided by law for ap-
13 portionment of funds for the Federal-aid primary system.

14 (c) The Federal share payable on account of any proj-
15 ect provided for by funds made available under the provisions
16 of this section shall be 75 per centum.

17 (d) Any sums apportioned to any State under the pro-
18 visions of subsection (b) of this section shall be available
19 for expenditure in that State for two years after the close of
20 the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized. Such
21 funds for any fiscal year shall be deemed to be expended in
22 such amounts, and at such times, as the Secretary of Com-
23 merce shall determine that the recipient State has actually
24 incurred contractual obligations thereunder for the perform-
25 ance of specific projects.

(e) Any amount apportioned to the States under the provisions of subsection (b) of this section unexpended at the end of the period during which it is available for expenditure under the terms of subsection (d) of this section shall lapse.

6 DEFENSE HIGHWAYS, INCLUDING CIRCUMFERENTIAL
7 HIGHWAYS

8 SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions
9 of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat.
10 765), as amended, and section 12 of the Federal-Aid High-
11 way Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), as amended, there is
12 hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of
13 \$100,000,000 to remain available until expended. When-
14 ever any project for the construction or improvement of a
15 circumferential highway around a city or of a radial intracity
16 route thereto submitted by any State, is certified by the Sec-
17 retary of Defense, or such other official as the President may
18 designate, as being important for civilian or military defense,
19 such project may be constructed under the authorization in
20 this section and in accordance with the conditions contained
21 therein. The Federal share payable on account of any
22 project for the construction or improvement of a circum-
23 ferential highway around a city or of a radial intracity route
24 thereto selected in accordance with the provisions of this sec-
25 tion shall be increased to 60 per centum of the total cost

1 thereof, plus a percentage of the remaining 40 per centum
 2 of such cost in any State containing unappropriated and un-
 3 reserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, indi-
 4 vidual and tribal, exceeding 5 per centum of the total area
 5 of all lands therein, equal to the percentage that the area of
 6 such lands in such State is of its total area.

7 FOREST HIGHWAYS

8 SEC. 4. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the provi-
 9 sions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat.
 10 218), as amended and supplemented, there is hereby author-
 11 ized to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum
 12 of \$22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and
 13 a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and (2)
 14 for forest development roads and trails the sum of \$22,500,-
 15 000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like
 16 sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

17 (b) With respect to any proposed construction or re-
 18 construction of a timber access road, advisory public hearings
 19 shall be held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area
 20 of construction or reconstruction with notice and reasonable
 21 opportunity for interested persons to present their views as
 22 to the practicability and feasibility of such construction or
 23 reconstruction.

24 (c) The appropriations authorized by subsection (a)
 25 for forest highways shall be apportioned by the Secretary

1 of Commerce for expenditure in the several States, Alaska,
2 and Puerto Rico in accordance with the provisions of sec-
3 tion 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950.

4 NATIONAL PARK ROADS, PARKWAYS, AND INDIAN ROADS

5 SEC. 5. (a) For the construction, reconstruction, and
6 improvement of (1) roads and trails, inclusive of necessary
7 bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas ad-
8 ministered by the National Park Service, including areas
9 authorized to be established as national parks and monu-
10 ments, and (2) national park and monument approach roads
11 authorized by the Act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat. 1053),
12 as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated
13 the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,
14 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30,
15 **1957.**

16 (b) For the construction, reconstruction, improvement,
17 and maintenance of parkways, authorized by Acts of Con-
18 gress, on lands to which title is vested in the United States,
19 there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of
20 \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and
21 a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

22 (c) For the construction, improvement, and mainte-
23 nance of Indian reservation roads and bridges and roads and
24 bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian
25 lands under the provisions of the Act approved May 26,

1 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be ap-
2 propriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year end-
3 ing June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year end-
4 ing June 30, 1957. The location, type, and design of all
5 roads and bridges constructed with funds authorized by this
6 section shall be approved by the Secretary of Commerce
7 before any expenditures are made thereon, and all such con-
8 struction shall be under the general supervision of the Sec-
9 retary of Commerce.

10 INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

11 SEC. 6. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions
12 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for cooperation with
13 Central American Republics in the construction of the Inter-
14 American Highway", approved December 26, 1941 (55
15 Stat. 860), as amended by section 11 of the Federal-Aid
16 Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950 (64
17 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to
18 the Department of State in addition to the sums heretofore
19 authorized, the sum of \$8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending
20 June 30, 1955, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending
21 June 30, 1956, to be available until expended, to enable the
22 United States to cooperate with the governments of the
23 American Republics situated in Central America in the sur-
24 vey and construction of the Inter-American Highway with-
25 in the borders of the aforesaid Republics. Not to exceed

1 one-third of the appropriation authorized by this section for
2 each fiscal year may be expended without requiring the
3 country or countries in which such sums may be expended
4 to match any part thereof, if the Secretary of State shall
5 find that the cost of constructing such highway in such
6 country or countries will be beyond their reasonable capacity
7 to bear.

8 ADVANCEMENT OF EFFECTIVE DATES OF AUTHORIZATIONS

9 SEC. 7. At any time that the President may determine
10 upon advice of the Council of Economic Advisers that the
11 level of national employment is such as to warrant an increase
12 in the volume of highway construction, he is hereby author-
13 ized to advance the effective dates of any authorizations in
14 this Act, except the authorizations in section 6, to a date not
15 more than one year earlier than the dates which would other-
16 wise be effective.

17 CONSULTATION WITH FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE

18 ADMINISTRATOR

19 SEC. 8. In order to assure that adequate consideration is
20 given to civil defense aspects in the planning and construc-
21 tion of highways constructed or reconstructed with the aid of
22 Federal funds, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized and
23 directed to consult, from time to time, with the Federal Civil
24 Defense Administrator relative to the civil defense aspects of
25 highways so constructed or reconstructed.

RESEARCH

SEC. 9. (a) In order to clarify and supplement the authority the Secretary of Commerce now has for carrying on necessary highway research, the Secretary is authorized in his discretion to engage in research of every nature and description, consonant with the objective of attaining adequate highway systems consisting of durable, safe, and low-cost highways. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing sentence, the Secretary, in connection with all phases of highway construction, reconstruction, modernization, development, design, maintenance, safety, financing, and traffic conditions, including the effect thereon of State laws, is authorized to conduct, assist, and foster research, investigation, and experimentation; and to test, develop, or assist in the testing and developing of any material, invention, patented article, or process. The Secretary may carry out the authority granted by this subsection, either independently, or in cooperation with any other branch of the Government, State agency, authority, association, institution, corporation (profit or nonprofit), or any other organization, or person. Whenever any research is carried on in cooperation with others, the Secretary in his discretion may enter into any such cooperative effort, with or without entering into a contract or agreement. If the Secretary does enter into a contract or agreement, it shall contain provisions

1 designed fairly and equitably to protect the interests of each
2 party thereto. The Secretary in his discretion shall dis-
3 seminate the results of any research activity to the extent
4 that he feels will be of benefit in furthering the aforesaid
5 objective. The funds required to carry out the provisions of
6 this subsection shall be taken out of the administrative and
7 research funds authorized by section 21 of the Federal High-
8 way Act (42 Stat. 212), as amended. The provisions of
9 section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C., sec. 5)
10 shall not be applicable to contracts or agreements made
11 under the authority of this subsection.

12 (b) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized and direc-
13 ted to make a study of the progress and feasibility of toll
14 roads with particular attention to the possible effects of such
15 toll roads upon the Federal-aid highway programs, and to
16 make a report of his findings including recommendations with
17 respect to Federal participation in toll roads, to be sub-
18 mitted to the Congress not later than April 1, 1955. Not to
19 exceed \$100,000 from funds available for administrative ex-
20 penses shall be expended for the purposes of this subsection.

21 STUDY OF RELOCATION OF PUBLIC UTILITIES NECESSITATED
22 BY HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

23 SEC. 10. The Secretary of Commerce is hereby directed
24 to cooperate with the State highway departments in a
25 study of the problems posed by necessary relocation and

1 reconstruction of public utilities services resulting from high-
2 way improvements authorized under this Act. Among other
3 things, such study shall include a review and financial anal-
4 ysis of existing relationships between the State highway
5 departments and affected utilities of all types, and a review
6 of the various State statutes regulating existing relationships,
7 to the end that a full and informative report may be made to
8 the President for transmittal to the Congress of the United
9 States not later than April 1, 1955.

10 DRAFT OF NEW FEDERAL HIGHWAY ACT

11 SEC. 11. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized and
12 directed to transmit to the Congress not later than December
13 31, 1954, a suggested draft of a bill or bills for a Federal
14 Highway Act, which will include such provisions of existing
15 law, and such changed or new provisions as the Secretary
16 deems advisable. The Secretary shall also submit a report
17 commenting on the draft of bill or bills, which shall include
18 specific reference to each change in, or omission of, any pro-
19 vision of existing law.

20 STATE APPORTIONMENTS AVAILABLE FOR STUDY OF

21 TOLL ROADS

22 SEC. 12. Section 8 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of
23 1944 is amended by inserting after the words "grade cross-
24 ing eliminations" the words "or toll roads".

1 CONTINUANCE IN EFFECT OF PREVIOUS FEDERAL-AID
2 HIGHWAY ACTS

3 SEC. 13. All provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway
4 Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838) ,
5 the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, approved June 29,
6 1948 (62 Stat. 1105) ; and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of
7 1950, approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785) ; and the
8 Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952, approved June 25, 1952
9 (66 Stat. 158) , not inconsistent with this Act, shall remain
10 in full force and effect and shall be applicable in carrying out
11 the provisions of this Act.

12 SEPARABILITY

13 SEC. 14. If any section, subsection, or other provision
14 of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circum-
15 stance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act and the
16 application of such section, subsection, or other provision
17 to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected
18 thereby.

19 REPEAL OF INCONSISTENT ACTS

20 SEC. 15. All Acts or parts of Acts in any way incon-
21 sistent with the provisions of this Act are hereby repealed.

22 SHORT TITLE

23 SEC. 16. This Act may be cited as the "Federal-Aid
24 Highway Act of 1954".

A BILL

To amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

By Mr. FERGUSON

MARCH 4 (legislative day, MARCH 1), 1954

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Public Works

Senate 3/11/44

Sen. Aiken defended Secretary Benson's cost figures and inserted USDA charts explaining the costs of agricultural and related programs, including the price support and REA programs, and said, "I believe the charts will at least counteract some of the vicious charges which have been made against the integrity of an honest man" (pp. 2518-25).

Sen. Humphrey inserted various Minn. farm organization resolutions opposing the reduction in dairy price supports, favoring direct production payments for dairy products, "demanding 90% of parity for dairy farmers," favoring 100% price supports "on farm products" and extension of the REA Program, opposing sale of Government power projects, favoring extension of present price support programs and restricting imports of oats, barley, rye and wheat, and proposing employment of agricultural extension agents in the Forest Service (pp. 2480-2).

SUGAR AGREEMENT. Sen. Wiley announced the appointment of a subcommittee to consider the International Sugar Agreement, with membership consisting of Sens. Aiken (chrmn.), Capehart, Ferguson, George and Mansfield. It is expected that the subcommittee will hold hearings on the agreement in the near future. (p. D232.)

SURPLUS FOOD. Sen. Gillette inserted and discussed correspondence with USDA, and the Labor and Interior Departments, wherein he urged swift action to establish a system whereby surplus foods can be more readily distributed to needy American citizens, particularly unemployed persons and elderly people receiving inadequate pensions (pp. 2484-6).

TOBACCO ALLOTMENTS. Sen. Clements inserted a constituent's telegram favoring S. 3050, to increase penalty rates on tobacco grown in excess of allotments (p. 2527).

APPROPRIATIONS. Received a Budget Bureau letter reporting that USDA's appropriation for fighting forest fires for the 1954 fiscal year had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate; to the Appropriations Committee (p. 2479).

TRANSPORTATION. A subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee ordered reported to the full committee, with amendments, H. R. 3792, to authorize the ICC to revoke or amend, under certain conditions, water-carrier certificates and permits (p. D232).

HAWAII STATEHOOD. Continued debate on S. 49, to grant statehood to Hawaii (pp. 2488-93, 2501-17).

TREATIES. Sen. Wiley inserted a New York Herald Tribune article summarizing the various votes on S. J. Res. 1, to restrict the President's treaty power (pp. 2486-7).

Sen. Ferguson spoke in favor of his bill, S. 3067, which would require the State Department to transmit to the Senate within 30 days the text of any executive agreement to which this country is a party (p. 2483).

RECESSED until Mon., Mar. 8 (p. 2531), when it will consider the Hawaii statehood bill (p. D231).

-4-

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

21. PERSONNEL. Sen. Carlson inserted Philip Young's statement before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee on the employee security program which included a chart showing breakdown by departments and agencies of dismissals (pp. 1707-10). Extension of remarks of Rep. Multer urging additional compensation for Federal workers (p. A1730).
22. SURPLUS FOOD. Sen. Humphrey inserted a New York Times editorial, "Food and Hunger" emphasizing the need for greater utilization of surplus food (pp. A1714-5).
23. FORESTS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Vorty favoring increased fire protection on watershed of Los Angeles County and inserting a Board of Supervisors (Los Angeles) resolution requesting increased appropriations for the Forest Service (pp. A1722-3).
24. RESEARCH; EXTENSION WORK. Rep. Frelinghuysen inserted Dr. William H. Martin's, Rutgers University; memorandum supporting President Eisenhower's recommendation for increased grants for agricultural research and extension work (p. A1732).
25. SOIL CONSERVATION. Rep. Smith (Wis.) inserted J. B. Gunlogson's article stating the need for coordination of soil conservation with other good practices, "elimination of duplication and cross-firing between services," prevention of political "exploitation of on-the-farm services," and that the "Soil Conservation Service and the Extension Service is a typical illustration of the most unnecessary overlapping organizations" (pp. A1743-4).
26. STATEHOOD. Sen. Hoey inserted a constituent's article opposing statehood for Alaska and Hawaii (p. A1714).
Del. Farrington inserted two articles favoring statehood for Hawaii and Alaska (pp. A1731-2).

BILLS INTRODUCED

27. ROADS. S. 3069, by Sen. Ferguson, to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to Public Works Committee (p. 2482). Remarks of author (pp. 2482-3).
28. WATER RESOURCES. S. 3070, by Sen. Barrett, to govern the control, appropriation, use, and distribution of water; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 2482).
29. MINERAL LANDS. S. 3071, by Sen. Barrett, to amend the act authorizing agricultural entries under the nonmineral land laws of certain mineral lands in order to increase the limitation with respect to desert entries made under such act to 320 acres; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 2482).
30. FORESTS. H.R. 8225, by Rep. Baker, to establish public use of the national forests as a policy of Congress; to Agriculture Committee (p. 2581).
31. MARKETING. H.R. 8226, by Rep. Cooley, to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities; to Agriculture Committee (p. 2581).

DIRECT PRODUCTION PAYMENTS FOR DAIRY PRODUCTS—RESOLUTION OF ROCK CREEK BOOSTERS CLUB, ROCK CREEK, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Rock Creek Boosters Club, Rock Creek, Minn., at its meeting on February 9, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred. The resolution expresses approval of the principle of direct production payments for dairy products.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The following resolution was unanimously adopted at the February meeting of the Rock Creek Boosters Club held at the C. Edwin Peterson farm home on February 9, 1954:

"Whereas the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson has declared he will seek a reduction from 90 to 75 percent of parity on dairy products; and

"Whereas the dairy farmers of the north-east are greatly disturbed by the act of the Secretary of Agriculture in singling out the dairy farmer for such drastic cut in his income; and

"Whereas the farmers cost of operating his farm is at its highest peak, as to tractors, farm machinery, repairs, gas labor, taxes, etc.; and

"Whereas the present method of handling by the Government the purchasing and storing of dairy products are not feasible nor economical: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That we favor the principle of direct production payments for dairy products there by consuming all the dairy products at its market place; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to our Senators and Congressmen, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C."

JOHN E. JOHNSON,
President, Rock Creek, Minn.
Mrs. ERVIN NELSON,
Secretary, Pine City, Minn.

After the meeting adjourned the following members signed the resolution and are on file with the secretary:

John E. Johnson, Rock Creek, Minn.; Gunnard Shoberg, Rush City, Minn.; Clifford Shoberg, Rush City, Minn.; Ernest Olson, Rush City, Minn.; Gust Christenson, Rush City, Minn.; Elmer Johnson, Rush City, Minn.; C. Edwin Peterson, Pine City, Minn.; Harold E. Peterson, Pine City, Minn.; Ervin L. Nelson, Pine City, Minn.; Louis Baum, Pine City, Minn.; Mrs. Alice Nelson, Pine City, Minn.; Mrs. Harold Peterson, Pine City, Minn.; Mrs. C. E. Peterson, Pine City, Minn.; Mrs. Freda Johnson, Rock Creek, Minn.; Mrs. Hannah Johnson, Rush City, Minn.; Mrs. Edith Christenson, Rush City, Minn.; Mrs. Mabel Shoberg, Rush City, Minn.; Mrs. Margaret Olson, Rush City, Minn.; Mrs. Viola Baum, Pine City, Minn.

EMPLOYMENT OF AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION AGENTS — RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, DULUTH, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the Board of Directors of the Duluth, Minn., Chamber of Commerce, on February 23,

proposing the employment of Agricultural Extension Agents in the Forestry Division of the Department of Agriculture.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Duluth Chamber of Commerce, through its agricultural council and its forestry committee, is cognizant of the vast amount of privately owned land in northeastern Minnesota which is suitable for forestry purposes, such as production of pulp, fence posts, veneer, and saw logs, which would supplement other regular farm income; and

Whereas those owning such lands are in need of technical assistance to aid them in planning a well managed, long-range forestry program; and

Whereas such special assistance has been made available in Itasca County by the employment of an extension agent in forestry, demonstrating, beyond all doubt, the value of such technical assistance in forestry to private land owners.

Therefore the Duluth Chamber of Commerce, through its agricultural council and forestry committee, resolves that the Congress of the United States give very serious consideration to the matter of shifting existing funds within the Department of Agriculture which would permit employment of agricultural extension agents in forestry; that these agents in forestry be located in the agricultural extension offices of the several counties in northeastern Minnesota, working and cooperating with the agricultural extension agent and other cooperating agencies to develop a long-range forestry management program which would benefit not only the private land owner who has land suitable for growth of trees, but would benefit society in general by making greater and wiser use of our natural resources; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our Congressmen and Senators in Washington, and that a copy be sent to the Director of Extension at University Farm, St. Paul, Minn.

RESOLUTIONS OF ROSEAU COUNTY (MINN.) FARMERS UNION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two resolutions adopted by the Roseau County Farmers Union, favoring a price support of 100 percent on farm commodities, and opposing the selling out of Government projects to private power companies, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROSEAU COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
Roseau, Minn., February 18, 1954.
Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: At our last Farmers Union County Board meeting we passed these two resolutions:

"The Roseau County Farmers Union Board, representing 800 farm families, goes on record favoring a price support of 100 percent or full parity on all farm commodities"

"The Roseau County Farmers Union Board goes on record opposing the selling of our Niagara Falls or any other Government project to any private power company for generating purposes."

Sincerely,

Mrs. TILFORD WICKLANDER,
Secretary.

RESOLUTIONS OF OKLEE FARMERS UNION, LOCAL 157, OKLEE, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two resolutions adopted by the Oklee Farmers Union Local, No. 157, Oklee, Minn., on February 12, favoring a price support of 100 percent of parity on farm products, and extending the REA program, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OKLEE, MINN., February 18, 1954.
Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: When we, the members of the Oklee Farmers Union Local, No. 157, Red Lake County, in a meeting assembled on Friday, February 12, 1954, the following resolutions were passed representing our 144 members:

"RESOLUTION 1

"A resolution was passed asking a support price of 100 percent of parity on all farm products including perishables with marketing quotas or production controls if necessary.

"Therefore we urge you to vote and strongly support this legislation when it comes up in Congress."

"RESOLUTION 2

"We favor extension of the REA program and further development of dam sites and hydroelectric power by the Federal Government. Cooperatives and municipalities to have first preference of such power. We are opposed to the proposed plan where cooperatives would be required to estimate their power needs for 20 years in advance. It would be impossible to estimate the needs for even a short time in advance due to the rapid increase of power needs."

Therefore we urge you to strongly support the extension of the REA and to strongly oppose and vote against the new power policy on the proposed plan requiring 20 years advancement estimates of power needs when it comes up in Congress.

OKLEE FARMERS UNION LOCAL,
Mrs. ALFRED SYRTVEIT,
Secretary-Treasurer.

RESOLUTION OF PINE ROCK GRANGE 775, PINE CITY, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by Pine Rock Grange, No. 775, Pine City, Minn., on February 17, demanding 90 percent of parity for dairy farmers, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PINE CITY, MINN., February 18, 1954.
Hon. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY:

The Pine Rock Grange, No. 775, at their meeting on February 17, passed a resolution demanding 90 percent parity for the dairy farmers and instructed me to send you a copy of same.

PINE ROCK GRANGE, No. 775.
JOE KARAS, Secretary.

RESOLUTIONS OF GOOD HOPE LOCAL, MINNESOTA FARMERS UNION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two resolutions adopted by the Minnesota Farmers Union, Good Hope local, on February 17, to extend the present price-support pro-

gram, and concerning the imports of oats, barley, rye, and wheat, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, the 95 family members of the Minnesota Farmers Union, Good Hope local, Pennington County, Minn., at local meeting held at B. F. Bieswenger home February 17, 1954, offer the following resolutions:

"RESOLUTION 1

"1. We urge that our Congressmen and Senators extend the present price-support program until its committees can develop a program that will give the farmers 100 percent of parity, which will be fair to producers and consumers alike.

"2. We urge that Congress take account of the Secretary of Agriculture setting the price of dairy products at 75 percent of parity and have them moved up to present levels which expire March 31, 1954.

"3. We are agreed that food occupies a position in the present international situation, where it is properly classified as a defense weapon.

"We urge, therefore, that congressional policies be written which will specify the upper and lower limits of the reserves of food and fibers and other agricultural products which are necessary to be maintained in the national interest, but that such reserves should be surrounded by safeguards which will effectively insulate them. Farmers should not be forced to assume the cost and other burdens of such reserves, when they are created in the national interest."

"RESOLUTION 2

"1. We urge our Congressmen and Senators deal promptly with the imports of oats, barley, rye, and wheat, when these imports of grains endanger the interests of the farmers and the Government.

"2. These imports are a direct abuse of price-support program.

"We urge once more that Congress take appropriate and prompt action to halt the imports of farm commodities that prevent attainment of the goal of parity prices."

JOE JOHNSON,

President.

Mrs. C. H. BEISWENGER,
Secretary.

EXCISE TAX ON TELEPHONE SERVICE—RESOLUTION OF BRAHAM FARMERS MUTUAL TELEPHONE ASSOCIATION, BRAHAM, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Braham Farmers Mutual Telephone Association, Braham, Minn., at their annual meeting, urging the elimination of the 15-percent Federal excise tax on telephone service, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STANCHFIELD, MINN., February 23, 1954.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At the annual meeting of the Braham Farmers Mutual Telephone Association the resolution written below was decided on in committee. The chairman, Mr. Charles A. Pearson, reported to the directors and delegates in regular session. This director organization represents 11 rural telephone companies around the Braham, Minn., area.

On motion seconded, and carried, L. L. Schaeffer, secretary, was ordered to spread on records said motion; and to send a copy to each Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Hon. EDWARD THYE, and Hon. ROY WIEB.

"Whereas there is now imposed a Federal excise tax of 15 percent of telephone service which imposes a severe and, we think, an unjust burden and additional cost on all telephone users, local as well as long distance. This tax steps up to 25 percent on calls over 24 cents charge. Since this tax as it is now applied has a crippling effect on small independent companies, it should receive the consideration of the tax-making bodies: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That we the directors of the Braham Farmers Mutual Telephone Association, in annual meeting assembled, and representing 210 rural telephone stations, do hereby respectfully urge the elimination or reduction of these discriminatory taxes."

Respectfully submitted.

L. L. SCHAEFFER,

Secretary, Braham Farmers Mutual Telephone Association, Braham, Minn.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. YOUNG, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 2911. A bill to provide for the development of a sound and profitable domestic wool industry under our national policy of expanding world trade, to encourage increased domestic production of wool for our national security, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1044).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FLANDERS:

S. 3068. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, relative to the process of selection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 3069. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. FERGUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. 3070. A bill to govern the control, appropriation, use, and distribution of water; and

S. 3071. A bill to amend the act authorizing agricultural entries under the nonmineral land laws of certain mineral lands in order to increase the limitation with respect to desert entries made under such act to 320 acres; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 3072. A bill for the relief of Spirodon Karousatos; and

S. 3073. A bill for the relief of Julius Rutigliano (Giulio Rutigliano); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 3074. A bill to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 to authorize the disposal of certain Federal surplus property to State and local units of the United States Civil Defense Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

DEVELOPMENT OF FEDERAL HIGHWAYS

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which I believe will provide adequate funds from the Federal Government for the development of the Nation's highways. I ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement in connection with the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately ferred; and, without objection, the Senator from Michigan may proceed.

The bill (S. 3069) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FERGUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, there is no substantial disagreement about the need for much swifter and broader action in the development and maintenance of our national highway system. The need is great, and bold action is required. This bill authorizes bold action.

The bill provides a total of \$2,208,000,000 for each of the 2 fiscal years, 1956 and 1957, for the Federal share of our highway program.

On the principal Federal-aid systems, where funds are matched by State and local agencies, this bill proposes \$2,175,000,000 against authorizations in the 1952 act of \$575 million for each year.

A large increase is proposed in funds available for the national system of interstate highways, from \$25 million to \$900 million. Large increases are also proposed for the Federal primary, secondary, and primary highways in urban area systems.

The bill I have introduced would also authorize the sum of \$100 million for defense highways, including circumferential highways around a city or intracity radial routes. I believe this is an important authorization in the bill because it will make funds available for development of necessary civil defense highways. These highways, necessary also in the everyday development of our cities, would also play a vital role in military and civil defense should such a need ever arise. They too, would be invaluable as evacuation routes, and, also as means of bringing support and assistance to areas affected in case of a bombing attack. I believe this Nation will be much better off if we construct evacuation highways for civil defense which can also be used every day rather than build bomb shelters that we hope will never be used.

In addition to these features, which I believe mark a positive, constructive and adequate approach to our highway problem, this bill contains highly desirable new legislative features.

First. The funds authorized in the bill would be apportioned among the States

United States Army, retired, at the Anniston, Ala., High School Armistice Day celebration.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

Address on the Eisenhower housing program, delivered on February 24, 1954, at Washington, D. C., by Charles E. Slusser, Commissioner of the Public Housing Administration.

By Mr. HOEY:

Statement by W. L. Totten, Sr., of Durham, N. C., on the subject of Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

Article from America for February 27, 1954, relative to proposed revision of United Nations Charter.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Editorial entitled "Food and Hunger," published in the New York Times of January 18, 1954.

DECLARATION OF UNITED STATES SOVEREIGNTY OVER AREAS OF THE ANTARCTIC CONTINENT

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, recently I have noted the interest being taken by the press and radio in my resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 127, declaring United States sovereignty over certain areas of the huge Antarctic Continent. This resolution is a companion measure to House Joint Resolution 353, introduced in this Congress and in prior Congresses by Representative TOLLEFSON, of Washington. In section 1 of the joint resolution, specific meridians, 90° to 150° west longitude, are given as boundaries of an area which American citizens have explored and which has not yet been claimed by any other country. Under section 2 of the joint resolution, all other American explored lands are included, and the President is requested to take necessary steps leading toward negotiation for the recognition of our claims in the areas which have been explored by Americans, but which today lie within the formal paper claims of other nations. I mention these two main sections of the joint resolution because in some press accounts the distinction between them has not always been clearly understood.

In taking action on a measure of this kind, the Congress will not in any way encroach upon the conduct of foreign affairs, which is rightly in the hands of the executive branch of our Government; but especially in regard to the tract not claimed by any other nation, the Congress quite properly has an opportunity to pass upon the declaration of our sovereignty. I hope the Foreign Relations Committee will soon find an opportunity to consider the joint resolution.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a portion of a newscast by David Wills over the National Broadcasting Co. network on February 16, 1954, on the program Three Star Extra, originating in Washington, D. C. I believe the commentator is to be commended for his research work in connection with claims of the United States as to parts of the Antarctic Continent.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Bills have been introduced in Senate and House to declare American sovereignty over parts of the Antarctic Continent, specifically

the area between the 90th and 150th meridians of longitude. This incidentally, is the worst stretch of coast on that whole frigid continent. No one has ever landed upon it from the sea, and no other country claims it.

Up to now the American official position has been that while we do not claim any land in Antarctica, we reserve the right to make any claims we wish and meanwhile we don't recognize the claims of any other country.

The Argentinians, the Chileans, and the English keep up a running quarrel over that part of Antarctica opposite South America, tear each others' huts down, sail a cruiser by to show strength, but never get too rough.

The Norwegians, English, Australians, New Zealanders, and the French have mutually recognized each others' claims, some of them rather tenuous; only one New Zealander has ever even seen the place.

The Russians thought they had a brave right since 1820 when an explorer named a cape Alexander the First Land, but it turned out to be only an island.

While no one lives in Antarctica, 10,000 men visit it yearly for whaling, and a land mass twice the size of the United States must have abundant minerals. The ice caps make them unworkable right now, but who knows what technological progress and atomic power may make possible in the future. A couple of centuries ago when the beaten French had to choose between ceding a couple of Caribbean islands or Canada to the English, they kept the then rich islands and surrendered the unwanted colds of Canada; now a fabulously wealthy nation.

The wealth of Antarctica may some day be opened up, and America will want her share, earned by many brave and successful explorations.

SURPLUS FOODS FOR NEEDY AMERICANS

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, on February 3, I addressed identical letters to the Secretaries of Agriculture, Labor, and Health, Education and Welfare, urging swift action to establish a system whereby surplus foods in Government stocks can be more readily distributed to needy American citizens, particularly unemployed persons and elderly people receiving inadequate pensions and insurance, and requesting that the Departments assign staff experts to cooperate with me in drafting proposed legislation.

As of today, I have received replies from the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Agriculture. The Department of Labor has offered to detail a staff man to work with me in the preparation of proposed legislation, but the Department of Agriculture has reported that "its studies and discussions have not progressed to the point where specific legislation can be formulated." The Department of Welfare has not yet replied to my letter dated 1 month ago.

A great many individuals from all parts of the country have written me about this proposal. I have also received a large number of thoughtful comments and suggestions from leaders of organizations concerned with this problem.

As matters of interest to the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the following communications relating to this food disposal plan be printed in the RECORD at this point:

From the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Labor, the Iowa Food Distributors Association, the General Fed-

eration of Women's Clubs, the National Council on Agricultural Life and Labor, the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, the Cooperative League of the USA, the National Association of Retail Grocers, and the Iowa CIO Council.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., February 12, 1954.
Hon. GUY M. GILLETTE,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in reply to your letter of February 3, concerning the possibility of using surplus food stocks to improve the diets of groups within this country with limited amounts of money to spend for food.

We appreciate and share your concern over the size of Government-held inventories and the need to find constructive uses for such surpluses without dislocating normal trade channels. Moreover, we are in complete agreement with the principle expressed in your letter that maximum use of such foods should be made in meeting the need of some of our citizens for improved diets before wide-scale dispositions are made for foreign relief purposes.

Many persons in this country are now benefiting from our donations of surplus foods. During this fiscal year, we now estimate that at least \$170 million worth of surplus foods will be distributed to over 9 million children in school-lunch programs and 1 million inmates of charitable institutions.

This use of surplus foods is being accomplished under our program of direct distribution, for which both the Federal Government and the States share responsibility. This Department arranges for and underwrites the costs incident to such donations up to the time such foods are delivered in carload lots to the States. The States are responsible for all subsequent costs of handling and delivery to eligible groups. Through the extensive use of existing storage and transportation facilities, States have developed quite effective delivery systems, with a minimum of out-of-pocket costs.

Needy families also are eligible to receive surplus foods under our present program of direct distribution. However, until recently, there has been but limited demand for such distribution; donations to needy families have been made only in certain areas in a few States and to Indian families on reservations. Recently, there has been a marked increase in interest in, and requests for, distribution on a family basis. In this connection, we want to point out that the Department has held that needy families are not necessarily limited to those receiving general assistance or welfare grants such as old-age assistance. Rather, as far as surplus commodities are concerned, needy families are those certified by State or local officials to be in need of additional food.

In response to these requests for family distribution, such donations are being accomplished as rapidly as States are able to arrange for the certification of applicant groups as needy and for the local handling and distribution of the commodities. We want to point out, in this connection, that the majority of States would be required to make considerable realignments in their delivery organizations (now based upon relatively infrequent deliveries to relatively large-volume users) in order to accomplish any wide-scale family distribution. Nonetheless, substantial progress is being made. Our latest report indicates that States are now providing surplus foods to 283,000 needy persons and that this number will shortly be increased by at least an additional 130,000 persons. Dairy products—butter, cheese, and dry milk—are making up a substantial

on the basis of a modified formula. One-half of the funds would be apportioned on the basis of existing law and one-half on the basis of the proportionate number of motor vehicle registrations in each State. I believe this is a sounder approach because our highway problem exists where the cars and trucks are and this bill would attack the problem directly.

Second. The entire amount for the farm-to-market roads of the Federal secondary system would be made available for disbursement to the States on a certification that the plans meet the requirements of the individual State. This would give States the opportunity to use their own initiative and resourcefulness to get maximum mileage in the secondary system. It would answer the criticism of some that greater mileage would be possible except for the standard required by the Bureau of Public Roads.

Third. Authority would be provided for the President to advance allocations made under this bill by 1 year if he finds that such a speedup would be desirable as a means of increasing employment.

Fourth. In order to assure that adequate consideration is given to the civil-defense aspects of highways, the bill directs that Federal highway officials consult periodically with the Federal Civil Defense Administrator.

Fifth. The bill provides a new and broadened section authorizing research activities on the part of the Bureau of Public Roads. I have felt for some time that research in highway planning and construction has not kept pace with the development of modern motor vehicles and believe this new authority will be beneficial in that respect.

Sixth. Because existing Federal legislation in the field on highways is contained in numerous different acts running back for many years, this bill directs the Federal highway officials to transmit to Congress a draft of consolidated and codified Federal highway legislation which I hope will eliminate some of the difficulty and confusion which now exists.

The sums which would be authorized in this bill are based on two separate and unrelated sets of facts:

First. The deficiencies in the federally supported highway systems is estimated by the President in his economic report to be \$35 billion. This bill contemplates a 15-year program of restoration of our national highways, at the rate of about \$2.2 billion per year. This bill is adequate to eliminate the existing backlog of highway needs within a reasonable period.

Second. This bill will authorize a sum approximately equal to the amount of revenue collected by the Federal Government from various highway-use taxes, including gasoline, oil, and various excise taxes on vehicles, tires, and accessories.

I hope an early public hearing will be held on the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at the conclusion of my remarks a comparative table of the au-

thorizations under the current act and those proposed by my bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison in authorizations in Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 and proposed authorization in Ferguson bill

Item or category	1952 act, Public Law 413, 82d Cong. for 1954-55 fiscal years	Ferguson bill, 1956-57 fiscal years
Federal-aid system:		
Primary system.....	\$247,500,000	\$425,000,000
Secondary system.....	165,000,000	350,000,000
Primary system in urban areas.....	137,500,000	350,000,000
Interstate system.....	25,000,000	900,000,000
Defense highways, including circumferential highways.....		100,000,000
Total, Federal-aid system.....	575,000,000	2,125,000,000
Federal roads:		
Forest highways.....	22,500,000	22,500,000
Forest-development roads and trails.....	22,500,000	22,500,000
Park roads and trails.....	10,000,000	10,000,000
Parkways.....	10,000,000	10,000,000
Indian roads and trails.....	10,000,000	10,000,000
Public lands roads.....	2,500,000	
Total, Federal roads.....	77,500,000	75,000,000
Total, each fiscal year.....	652,500,000	2,200,000,000
Total, for both years.....	1,305,000,000	4,400,000,000
Special authorizations:		
Inter-American Highway.....	16,000,000	16,000,000
Other.....	65,500,000	
Total, special authorizations.....	81,500,000	16,000,000
Grand total.....	1,386,500,000	4,416,000,000

SUBMISSION OF INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS TO THE SENATE

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I did not want to take the time of the Senate last night in connection with Senate bill 3067 which I introduced at that time for myself and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], but I would like to briefly call it to the attention of the Senate at this time.

The bill would require the State Department to transmit to the Senate within 30 days the text of any executive agreement or other international agreement to which the United States is a party. The bill also provides that the President of the Senate shall refer the agreement to the appropriate committee of the Senate, or the appropriate joint committee.

At the present time, the State Department is required by section 102 of the United Nations Charter to send the text of these international agreements to the U. N., but there is no requirement that they advise the United States Senate.

I believe this is completely unreasonable, so the Senator from California and I have introduced corrective legislation.

We would be pleased to have other interested Senators join us in sponsoring this proposed legislation.

JOHN SAUDAS—MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on the Consent Calendar, last Tuesday, the Senate passed and sent to the House Senate bill 1138, for the relief of John Saudas. I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which that bill was passed, and I have been advised by the Parliamentarian that it will be necessary that the House be requested to return the bill to the Senate. There are certain features of the bill which I should like to consider further. I have discussed the matter with the majority leader.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion to reconsider the vote will be entered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I move that the House be requested to return the bill to the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Delaware requesting the House to return to the Senate, Senate bill 1138.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, as acting majority leader, I wish to commend the Senator from Delaware for the action which he has just taken. This is another example of the able manner in which the Senator from Delaware performs his senatorial duties. The motion involves a very serious matter, and as a result thereof the Senate will be required carefully to review proposed legislation passed this week on the consent calendar. I am very proud that the Senator from Delaware invites our attention to the seriousness of some of our actions, particularly when they appear to be ill considered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. FERGUSON:

Statement prepared by him on the anniversary of Hungarian Independence Day.

Statement prepared by him on the anniversary of the Soviet nomination of Rumania.

By Mr. CARLSON:

Statement on the employee security program, delivered by Philip Young, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee on March 2, 1954.

By Mr. HILL:

Address entitled "What the Flag Means to Me," delivered by Col. George A. O'Connell,

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued March 8, 1954
For actions of March 5, 1954
83rd-2nd, No. 42

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....4	Flood control.....18	Public works.....7
Appropriations.....3	Forestry.....13,20	Reclamation.....17
CCC.....1,21	Health.....2	Roads.....2
Dairy products.....8	Labor, farm.....12	St. Lawrence Seaway.....11
Electrification.....17	Legislative program.....4	Surplus commodities.....9,10
Expenditures.....16	Loans, farm.....1,5	Taxation.....2
Farm program.....19	Personnel.....14	T.V.A.....15
Farm training.....6	Prices, support.....1,8,10,21	Veterans' benefits.....6

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed bill to increase CCC borrowing authority. House Rules Committee cleared road-authorizations and excise-tax reduction bills. Reps. Whitten and Marshall introduced bills to continue existing price supports.

HOUSE

1. COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION. Passed without amendment S. 2714, to increase the borrowing power of CCC from \$6,750,000,000 to \$8,500,000,000, effective immediately, and to provide for CCC reimbursement for not realized losses only, such reimbursement to be by appropriation instead of note cancellation (p. 2611). Before passing S. 2714, the House voted; 58-180, against a motion by Rep. Multer to recommit H. R. 7339, the companion bill which was being debated at the time (p. 2611). Also rejected, 48-89, an amendment by Rep. Spence providing that "Hereafter, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not issue or sell any of its obligations to any person other than the Secretary of the Treasury; however, this sentence shall not apply to certificates issued by the Commodity Credit Corporation to banks making Commodity Credit Corporation loans" (pp. 2598-604). Also rejected, 73-109, an amendment providing "That the Corporation shall not issue any obligations (other than to the Secretary of the Treasury) at a rate of interest in excess of 25 percent of the rate of interest (or comparable cost) paid by the Treasury of the United States on the most recently issued obligations of the United States of comparable maturity, except that the provisions of this proviso shall not apply to lending agency agreements applicable to loans under a commodity loan program" (pp. 2604-8). S. 2714 will now be sent to the President.

2. ROADS; TAXATION; HEALTH. The Rules Committee reported resolutions for consideration of H. R. 8127, authorizing road appropriations (p. 2583); ~~H. R. 8224, to reduce excise taxes (p. 2611); and H. R. 8149, authorizing additional appropriations for health facilities (p. 2583).~~

3. STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1955. Passed with amendments

this bill, H. R. 8067 (pp. 2585-6).

4. ADJOURNED until Mon., Mar. 8 (p. 2615). Legislative program, as announced by Majority Leader Halleck: Mon., road authorizations; Tues., health facilities; Wed., excise-tax reduction; Thurs., Mexican farm-labor appropriation and watershed bills. During the following week, probably Army civil-functions appropriations and general tax-reduction bills. (p. 2610.)

BILLS INTRODUCED

5. FARM LOANS. H. R. 8248, by Rep. Elliott, to expand and extend the direct home and farmhouse loan authority of the Veterans' Administration; to Veterans' Affairs Committee (p. 2615).
6. FARM TRAINING. H. R. 8249, by Rep. Elliott, to remove the requirement of automatic periodic reduction of the education and training allowances of veterans pursuing on-the-job training or institutional on-farm training under the Veterans' Readjustment Act; to Veterans' Affairs Committee (p. 2615).
7. PUBLIC WORKS. H. R. 8250, by Rep. Kelley, Pa., to provide for public works to offset unemployment; to Public Works Committee (p. 2615).
8. PRICE SUPPORTS. H. R. 8251, by Rep. Reed, N. Y., to limit the downward adjustment of dairy price supports; to Agriculture Committee (p. 2615).
H. R. 8253, by Rep. Whitten, and H. R. 8256, by Rep. Marshall, to continue existing price supports under present conditions; to Agriculture Committee (p. 2616).
9. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. H. R. 8257, by Rep. Perkins, and H. R. 8258, by Rep. Sheppard, to provide adequate diets for the unemployed and their families in distress areas of unemployment; to Agriculture Committee (p. 2616).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

10. PRICE SUPPORTS. Rep. Stringfellow inserted and commended Secretary Benson's speech, "Let Us Think, Decide, and Act," wherein the Secretary discusses the problems created by huge commodity surpluses and opposes "rigid price supports" (pp. A1761-3).
11. ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY. Reps. Friedel and Van Zandt inserted letters and statements opposing this project (pp. A1750-1, A1757-8).
12. FARM LABOR. Rep. Rooney inserted a New York Times article claiming that passage of H. J. Res. 355, to continue the Mexican farm labor program in the absence of an agreement with Mexico, "has stirred intense anger" in Mexico (p. A1757).
13. FORESTRY. Extension of remarks of Rep. Hays commending the action of various Congressmen in helping to recommit H. R. 4646, the public-for-private timberlands exchange bill, and including Lowell Mellett's article discussing this matter (p. A1761).
14. PERSONNEL. Extension of remarks of Rep. Roosevelt criticizing the standards used in determining security risks in the Federal Government and including the transcript of the exchange between Rep. Sieminski and a Treasury Department official as to what constitutes a security risk (pp. A1763-4).

CONSIDERATION OF H. R. 8127

MARCH 5, 1954.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H. Res. 460]

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 460, report the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution do pass.



House Calendar No. 155

83^D CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. RES. 460

[Report No. 1309]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 5, 1954

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution; which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

RESOLUTION

1 *Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it
2 shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into
3 the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union
4 for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8127) to amend
5 and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July
6 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented,
7 to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction
8 of highways, and for other purposes, and all points of order
9 against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate,
10 which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to ex-
11 ceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the
12 chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee

1 on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under
2 the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration
3 of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and
4 report the bill to the House with such amendments as may
5 have been adopted and the previous question shall be con-
6 sidered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to
7 final passage without intervening motion except one motion
8 to recommit.

H. RES. 460

[Report No. 1309]

RESOLUTION

Providing for the consideration of H. R. 8127, a bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois

MARCH 5, 1954

Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued March 9, 1954
For actions of March 8, 1954
83rd-2nd, No. 43

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....17,37	Foreign aid.....7,13	Price supports..4,10,20,25
Budgeting.....13	Forestry.....1,7,8,28	Purchasing.....15
CCC.....11,17	Grain storage.....11	Reclamation.....29
Cotton.....27	Hawaii.....16	Reports.....18
Dairy.....4,22,24,32,35	Intergovernmental relations.....36	Road authorizations...1,30
Disease control.....22	Labor, farm.....5,14,26	Statistics.....6
Electrification...18,19,20	Lands.....8,33	Trade, foreign.....9,12,34
Exchange stabilization..18	Loans, farm.....3	Veterans benefits.....31
Expenditures.....13	Minerals.....33	Wheat.....9,11
Farm credit.....17	Personnel.....13	Wool.....10
Food standards.....21	Pesticide chemicals.....2	
Food surplus.....23,34		

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed road authorization bill. House committees voted to report bills to regulate pesticide chemicals and to authorize land banks to buy FFMC assets. Rep. Cooley urged President not to approve Mexican farm labor bill. Senate passed forest-grazing policies bill. Sen. Butler, Nebr., claimed administration inherited commodity surpluses and outlined storage program. Sen. Humphrey claimed Minn. businessmen favor high price supports. Senate debated Hawaii statehood bill. Sen. Humphrey introduced and discussed bill to distribute dairy surpluses to needy.

HOUSE

1. ROAD AUTHORIZATIONS. Passed without amendment H. R. 8127, to authorize road appropriations for the fiscal years 1956 and 1957 (pp. 2675-707). The bill includes authorization of 22,500,000 for forest highways for each of these years and 22,500,000 for forest roads and trails for each of the years. It also provides that hereafter funds available for forest development roads and trails shall also be available for vehicular parking areas.
2. PESTICIDE CHEMICALS. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 7125 with amendments. The bill would prohibit the use of pesticide chemicals as additives to raw agricultural commodities unless the quantity does not exceed the limits of tolerance as established by HEW or is exempted from the requirement of tolerance by the Secretary of HEW. It also provides for regulations for classifications of pesticide chemicals according to the degree of tolerance, etc. (p. D246.)
3. FARM LOANS. The Agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 6711, to authorize Federal land banks to make a bulk purchase of remaining assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, except cash, accounts receivable, and reserved mineral interests (p. D245).

4. DAIRY PRICE SUPPORTS. The Agriculture Committee received the report of its Dairy Subcommittee (p. D246).
5. FARM LABOR. Rep. Cooley urged that the President not approve H. J. Res. 355, the Mexican farm labor bill, in view of recent resumption of negotiations with Mexico. Rep. McCormack concurred in this view. (pp. 2709-10.)
6. STATISTICS. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported without amendment S. 2348, to repeal the provision for the Census Bureau to collect and publish statistics of red-cedar shingles (H. Rept. 1325)(p. 2714).
7. FOREIGN AID. Both Houses received from the President a report on the mutual security program for the last half of 1953 (H. Doc. 337)(pp. 2618, 2674).

SENATE

8. FORESTRY. Passed as reported S. 2548, to facilitate the administration of certain grazing lands (pp. 2655-63).

As reported and passed, the bill provides as follows:

Section 1 makes the bill applicable to national forest lands and lands administered under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, except those administered by Interior, and makes it applicable to lands in all States rather than the 14 States named in the original version.

Sec. 2 provides for encouraging range improvements by grazing permittees by assuring the permittee that he will receive the benefits of the increased grazing capacity resulting from improvements made by him, providing for compensating a permittee for loss of a range improvement caused by the Federal Government, providing for payment by a subsequent permittee to his predecessor of the value of improvements constructed by such predecessor, and providing for amortizing the value of any range improvement over its normal life.

Sec. 3 provides for regulations governing transfers of grazing privileges, so that grazing cuts cannot be based solely on the fact that a permit is being transferred.

Sec. 4 provides for maintenance of base property standards (land, water, and improvements required to qualify for a grazing permit) consistent with local practices.

Sec. 5 provides for informal appeals, up to the Secretary, from any departmental decision respecting use of lands covered by the bill, provides for appeal to a 3-man board upon request, and makes this provision applicable to all uses of the lands instead of grazing only.

Sec. 6 provides for a formal review de novo, at which a record is made, for anyone dissatisfied with the informal review.

Sec. 7 provides a further appeal to the U. S. district court.

Sec. 8 provides that the review by the district court shall be based upon the record made in the formal review under Sec. 6.

Sec. 9 provides that the formal and court reviews provided by the bill would operate to stay the decision appealed from only if the Secretary or the court should so order.

Sec. 10 makes the review procedures provided by the bill exclusive, preserves the Secretary's discretion to make protection or changed use cuts, and excludes decisions on such cuts from the formal and court review procedures.

Sec. 11 provides for multiple-use advisory councils.

Sec. 12 expresses the policy that all resources and uses of the lands covered by the bill be safeguarded and given full consideration.

The Committee struck out the provision for a comprehensive economic study to determine suitable grazing fees, on the basis that such a study is already authorized. However, the committee report states, "Your committee feels that

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1954

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 460 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8127) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] and yield myself such time as I may consume, and I further ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 460 makes in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 8127, the so-called public roads bill, introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR]. This is an open rule, and it provides for 2 hours of general debate.

This bill is the usual public roads measure which is brought into the Congress every 2 years, except it is an enlarged bill. It goes further, perhaps, than any other measure of this type that we have considered for a great many years. The authorization for public roads for this year, for instance, if my memory serves me correctly, is \$550 or \$575 millions. This measure carries an authorization for public roads purposes of \$875 million per year for the 2 years beginning in 1955.

The McGregor bill, the measure before you, is the product of some 13 weeks of subcommittee hearings by the Subcommittee on Public Roads of the House Committee on Public Works. It carries authorization for the appropriation of \$270 million for the primary highway system, that is, the Federal aid to be matched by State funds, which is an increase of \$32,500,000 over the provisions in the present law.

The bill carries an authorization of \$180 million a year in appropriations for Federal aid for the secondary system, for the farm-to-market roads for the Nation, an increase of some \$15 million above the present authorization. Incidentally, and rather importantly, too, I

might say, this measure provides that in the future the State highway departments shall have the control and final authority over the specifications for farm-to-market roads included in the secondary highway system rather than the Public Roads Administration of the Federal Government, as in the past.

This bill provides also for an interstate highway system of \$200 million, or \$175 million more than provided in the present law. This interstate system, by the way, is requested by the military authorities of the Nation and will be of great benefit to all States. Incidentally, the matching arrangement on the interstate system is a little different from the ordinary matching system in the Federal-aid-to-highways proposals in the past. Usually the matching has been on a 50-50 basis. However, this bill provides that on interstate systems under the \$200 million appropriation authorized, the matching should be on the basis of 60 percent Federal funds and 40 percent State funds. This is done, as I understand it, for the purpose of helping the lower income States in the West which have such large areas and such long road systems that must be constructed, if we are to have a national highway system worthy of the name.

The bill would authorize an appropriation of \$875 million out of an estimated income from gasoline taxes of some \$906 million. This would leave approximately \$31 million to be used for emergency purposes. I think I should point out very clearly, if I may, that the \$200 million fund authorized for construction of an interstate highway system is predicated upon the Congress continuing the one-half-cent gasoline tax, which was put on as part of the Korean war emergency effort. I have been requested to point out, as it was pointed out to us in the Committee on Rules, that the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives appreciates fully that it has no authority or jurisdiction of any kind over questions as to whether or not this one-half-cent gasoline tax is to be extended. That is a matter over which only the Committee on Ways and Means has original jurisdiction. That great Committee on Ways and Means will, of course, give consideration to the question as to whether the one-half-cent gasoline tax is to be extended or is to be permitted to die. So, the Committee on Public Works has so drawn this bill that in case the Committee on Ways and Means, or the Congress itself decides not to extend the one-half-cent gasoline tax, the emergency tax which is now in existence, the interstate system and the money authorized therefor will be eliminated and will not be put into effect. Am I correct in that statement, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman please repeat that statement. I am very much interested in that part of the bill to which the gentleman from Ohio is now addressing himself concerning the

gasoline-tax provision. Did the gentleman say that is going to be stricken from the bill?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No, I did not say it would be stricken from the bill. I tried to point out that the Committee on Public Works in appearing before the Committee on Rules made it very clear that the \$200 million fund for the construction of the interstate-highway system to be allocated to the States on a 60-40 percent basis was dependent upon whether the one-half-cent gasoline tax now in effect and due to expire is extended by the Congress. They made it very clear also that the Committee on Public Works did not assume, or did not attempt, to take any jurisdiction whatsoever over any tax legislation, and that this question of whether the one-half-cent gasoline tax is to be extended or permitted to expire rests entirely with the Committee on Ways and Means, and then following any action of the Committee on Ways and Means, any action that the Congress itself may take. However, as I understand it, this legislation is so drawn that if for any reason the Committee on Ways and Means or the Congress itself decides not to extend the one-half-cent emergency-gasoline tax, then this section of the bill will not apply. In other words, the funds will not be appropriated or authorized under the \$200 million interstate system plan which was set up.

Mr. McCORMACK. Has the gentleman any views as to the effect of this particular provision on the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think it has been made pretty clear in the hearings and so forth and so on, of the committee, and in the statements made by the committee, and those statements which I understand will be made later on in debate, so that the Committee on Appropriations will understand clearly.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not going to press the matter further with my friend because, of course, he is speaking on and presenting the rule. I was interested in that particular provision because it seems to me to be a most unusual one.

I have no recollection of any similar provision being included in any other bill for this.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. In other words, if I may express my understanding of the situation to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] the Public Works Committee, being pressed by many States and by many Members of Congress for some action on this interstate system, finally agreed that they would include the authorization in the bill subject, of course, to later action by the Ways and Means Committee and the House itself. In other words, they did not feel that they should authorize a greater amount of money than would be available under the present law, if it is continued.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. This linking up of the Federal tax on gasoline and the road program is setting quite a precedent, and

in view of the fact that the Manion Commission has gone thoroughly into the subject of Federal aid for roads and will have a comprehensive report upon the same, it is doubtful whether the Congress should preview this matter and disregard entirely what the Manion Commission may report and may recommend, by taking this action at this time. I feel that we are establishing a precedent that is a doubtful one. I feel that the Congress should wait at least until they get the report and the recommendations of the Manion Commission on Federal aid for roads.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman very much for his contribution.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] knows, when we levied this half-cent tax on gasoline, it was meant to go into the general revenue, and there was no intention that the proceeds of that tax or the continuation of that tax, which we voted the other day, should be specifically applied to roads. I agree that it would be a very bad thing to have in the law.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understand that the bill does not specifically tie the two together.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. That may be true, as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] has just stated. But I venture to say that 99 out of every 100 people who drive up to a station for gasoline, consciously or perhaps unconsciously, think or understand that the 2 cents a gallon he has to pay for the gas that he buys is in some way connected with the roads of this country and he thinks that that money is being expended for that purpose.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I agree with the gentleman from Michigan. That is exactly the statement I was going to make. There is a strong feeling—and I am one who feels that way—that if we are to levy gasoline taxes on a Federal basis, or for that matter on a State basis, the funds derived from such special gasoline taxes ought to go where the American people think they are going and where they want them to go, on the highways of the Nation.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I have had a number of people talk to me about this language and what it might mean as some sort of a perpetual Federal tax, as against a State tax. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] properly referred, of course, to the Commission's work on intergovernmental relations and what might be forthcoming. Let me say that, as far as I am concerned—and I think it is the attitude of the committee—this does not build anything in perpetuity. If in the future it is determined that the Federal Government should get out of the field of gasoline taxation and turn it back to the

States, there is nothing here to prevent that being done. That is a matter for continuing study. But what is here sought to be done—and I am for it, and I think generally speaking the Members of the House will be for it—is to see to it that when this becomes effective the money that the people pay in the form of gasoline taxes shall be applied to the building of roads. That is a battle that has gone on in the States before. It went on in my State. It is still going on there. Of course, there are many other taxes, excise taxes, for instance, on automobiles and on lubricating oil and on tires that are not covered here.

Those taxes go into the general revenue to cover the general operations of the Government. But here we are dealing with a specific thing, which is the gasoline tax; and, as the gentleman from Ohio so well points out, it is a tax that the people believe is being expended in the construction of roads and that is where they want it expended.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman very much. I would like to point out, if I may, that the American motorist is the highest taxed individual in the world. He is being taxed in every direction for every purpose. All that the Committee on Public Works is endeavoring to do in this legislation, as I understand it, is to set up a system of distribution of Federal funds for highway aid purposes somewhat realistic to the amount of money that is being collected from the American people in the form of gas taxes, although by no means the full amount of the gasoline taxes. If that were to be done it would require new legislation. But the people who pay the tax are certainly very much interested, and that is the sort of logic that the committee is following out wisely and well. They have done everything within their power to make certain that they will not intrude upon the rights and privileges of either the Ways and Means Committee or the Members of the House and Senate themselves.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. There have been some observations made by the chairman of the committee and also by the distinguished majority leader that would make the record appear that the 2 cents is going to be used in connection with roadbuilding. That, of course, is not so.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman is correct. The money is paid into the general revenue funds as gasoline taxes, and this comes out of the general revenue funds.

Mr. McCORMACK. And if the committee were to bring out a bill providing that gasoline taxes would be used only for roads that would be a different proposition. I would agree to that.

Mr. MASON. So would I.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am sure we would both agree on that, but the money included in this bill comes out of the general revenue funds.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gasoline tax is paid into the general funds of the Treasury.

I think the gentleman would go a step further and say that if Congress decided that for highway purposes we were to appropriate twice or three times as much out of the general revenue funds as the gasoline taxes we would have a perfect right to do it under the present law and setup. But what the Committee on Public Works is attempting to do here, as I say, is to make a somewhat realistic allocation of highway funds for Federal-aid purposes on the basis of what is being collected in gasoline taxes and going into the revenue fund.

Mr. McCORMACK. We want the record to show that this bill does not provide that the gasoline taxes imposed, or the revenue derived from them shall be used in connection with road building.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I have tried to point that out to the best of my ability. Perhaps I am not sufficiently intelligent to make it clear.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Ohio is very intelligent. I simply wanted the record to show in view of the statement made by the majority leader—

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I believe it does.

Mr. McCORMACK. That this applies to the half-cent tax.

What I do not like about it—I am not saying I am opposed to it—but what I do not like about it is that this is conditional legislation and it seems to me it might fall within the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee to consider.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would suggest that we go ahead and adopt this rule and reserve our questions for a discussion of the merits of the bill later.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 26]

Abblitt	Forrester	Multer
Ayres	Gamble	O'Brien, N. Y.
Barrett	Garmatz	O'Neill
Battle	Gary	Osners
Bender	Granahan	Patman, Tex.
Bentley	Green	Patterson
Boland	Gwinn	Philbin
Bosch	Hand	Phillips
Brownson	Hart	Powell
Buckley	Heller	Radwan
Byrne, Pa.	Herlong	Rains
Camp	Hillings	Rayburn
Canfield	Holfield	Reams
Celler	Holtzman	Reece, Tenn.
Chelf	Hunter	Rivers
Chudoff	Javits	Roberts
Clardy	Jensen	Rodino
Cotton	Kearney	Rogers, Fla.
Coudert	King, Pa.	Roosevelt
Davis, Tenn.	Klein	Small
Dawson, Ill.	Knox	Sutton
Dodd	Krueger	Taylor
Donovan	Lantaff	Weichel
Dorn, S. C.	Latham	Wickersham
Edmondson	Martin, Iowa	Widnall
Elliott	Miller, Calif.	Williams, N. J.
Engle	Miller, N. Y.	Wilson, Calif.
Fallon	Morgan	Wilson, Tex.
Fine	Morrison	Yates
Fino	Moss	
Fogarty	Moulder	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 336 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have permission to sit during general debate for the balance of the week on H. R. 7839.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1954

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make this statement, that so far as I can speak for the Ways and Means Committee, I do not consider that this is any impingement upon the rights of our committee. I am very much in favor of this proposal as presented in this bill.

I think it is essential, and I think the bill is very well drawn. All that the Ways and Means Committee is doing under the excise tax is simply to extend the gasoline tax as requested by the President.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from New York, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means; I thank him very much for his statement.

I would like to say again that perhaps the greatest need of this Nation basically today is for better roads. Almost all of us recognize that the highway system has deteriorated greatly throughout the Nation during the war years. The number of automobiles on the highways today is much larger than it was just a few short years ago.

Perhaps there may be some need for expanded employment in this country in the days ahead; no one knows at the present moment, but I do know that many States are taking action now to try to build better and more highways. My own State just last fall by a vote of the people authorized a bond issue of some \$500 million to be expended in the State on State highways and county roads in addition to the \$80 million a year that is spent on a regular basis. So it is necessary if we are to have good highways in this country that we continue this Federal-aid program, either that or turn the tax money back to the States.

I think the Committee on Public Works has done well in preparing this legislation. It is comprehensive legislation. Perhaps none of it is exactly the way each and every one of us would like to have it, but it is a good well-rounded bill, and it does return to the local communities and to the States for highway purposes most of the money that the people of the United States put into the

general revenue fund through gasoline taxes.

I am hopeful that this rule will be adopted promptly and that we may turn to the consideration of this measure on its merits in 2 hours of general debate under an open rule. You will have an opportunity to offer any amendment you wish. I am hopeful that the rule will be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY].

(Mr. DEMPSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in taking the floor now is not to go over too much what occurred in our committee but I just want to point out to the membership of this House what this bill proposes.

The able gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], who just preceded me compared this bill to the last highway-aid bill, and told you that in the existing bill we have \$575 million appropriated for the use of highways. That is true, but I will say to my friend from Ohio that Indian roads and forest roads previously have been financed from money coming from other sources.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am not going on last year's bill; I am telling what is in this bill, \$550 million to \$575 million.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is not the fact because it also includes Indian roads and forest roads. The comparison is not equitable.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Perhaps the comparison is wrong; I do not know. But I do know that the highway bill as reported by the Public Works Committee last year carried \$550 million to \$575 million.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Five hundred and seventy-five million dollars exclusive of forest roads and Indian roads.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the gentleman will permit, Public Law No. 413 of the 82d Congress provided \$247,500,000 for the primary system.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman is right.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. One hundred and sixty-five million dollars for the secondary system.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. One hundred and thirty-seven million five hundred thousand dollars for primary and urban; and the interstate system \$25 million which if my arithmetic is correct adds up to \$575 million. Now, if I have been given incorrect information, I am very sorry, but that is from the public law that was passed by the last session.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I am proud of the gentleman for being a great mathematician because he is 100 percent right, but in the bill before us he adds elements that are not in that bill, so it is not a fair comparison.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. We do have in this bill some items that were not in the

other bills; however, this bill does carry a total of \$875 million.

Mr. DEMPSEY. In that bill, and the figures the gentleman has just read do not include forest roads and Indian roads.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is right. We did not have as much in that bill as we do in this one.

Mr. DEMPSEY. You had as much for forest roads and Indian roads. But we will not confuse that. The comparison is just not equitable because you cannot compare all the elements in the two propositions.

The bill that we are considering has several elements that I disapprove. We have now three categories in the allocation of funds. The first is interstate. Interstate roads are nothing else but the cream of the primary roads that the Defense Department, the Bureau of Public Roads, and the highway departments of the respective States selected as being defense roads. We made them interstate roads because of the comprehensive system we need here in the United States for defense purposes.

The interstate, the primary, and the secondary funds have always been apportioned to the States on a formula predicated upon population, area, and miles of road. The urban are on a different basis, on population alone, and you can see why that should be. It affects the cities.

Now, we have changed the formula. This bill that is before you today splits the \$200 million for interstate roads notwithstanding they are defense roads, notwithstanding they were approved by the Defense Department, in fact, recommended by that Department, and puts half of the \$200 million on a strictly population basis.

What does that do to the defense highways? Well, the great State of Texas has 2,500 miles of defense roads and on this population-basis apportionment they lose in the 2 years \$3,600,000.

There are 19 States affected here and they are all affected in the same way—they all are victims of discrimination. The State of Alabama loses \$279,000; Arizona, \$772,000; Arkansas, \$510,000; Colorado, \$1,002,000; Georgia, \$388,000; Idaho, \$507,000; Iowa, \$830,000; Kansas, \$1,278,000; Kentucky, \$59,000; Maine, \$112,000; Minnesota, \$789,000; Mississippi, \$469,000; Missouri, \$520,000; Montana, \$1,288,000; Nebraska, \$1,153,000; Nevada, \$565,000; New Mexico, \$903,000; North Carolina, \$15,000; North Dakota, \$726,000; Oklahoma, \$790,000; Oregon, \$793,000; South Carolina, \$64,000; South Dakota, \$838,000; Tennessee, \$172,000; Texas, \$1,823,000; all annually. Then there is Utah, \$424,000; Washington, \$212,000; Wisconsin, \$281,000; Wyoming, \$521,000. In the 2 years this bill covers, fiscal 1956 and 1957, all of the States I have enumerated will lose double the amounts I have just stated.

The States that I have just given you are charged with the responsibility of the care of 64 percent—about two-thirds—of the defense roads. Those with about one-third of the interstate mileage get more than all the States to which I have just called your attention.

In other words, the States with one-third of that mileage are given almost 50 percent more of the Federal funds than are the States with twice as much mileage.

Now, I am not going to talk too long on this subject. We fought in the committee up and down, and the majority of my committee felt that they would split it two ways and let it go at that.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MCGREGOR. My distinguished colleague said that the majority of the committee split it two ways. My distinguished friend from New Mexico was the only one who objected to splitting it two ways.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I have not denied that; that is just what I am bragging about, if you will let me do it, because there is a principle involved here. You have changed the formula that has been in existence a great many years. Now we find that a gentleman in another part of this Capitol, in another branch of the Congress, wants to change the apportionment made to farm-to-market roads and put it on the basis of the number of automobiles owned by the respective States. We are getting away from a comprehensive system of highways and going back to something that I dislike because, after all, if in defense areas radar or something of that kind was needed, and it cost a billion dollars, I would vote for it. You do not need it in sparsely settled areas, but in sparsely settled areas is where you have your defense projects. They need roads there. I have in my State a project that is over 90 miles long and 30 miles wide. They condemned much of that land owned by ranchers because it was needed by the Federal Government, and I was happy the Government obtained it.

Now, there are several things about this bill I want to call to your attention. I promised the chairman of my committee, who introduced the bill, I would be for retaining 2-cent gasoline and diesel fuel tax. I am for it, but I believe the money should go to the construction of highways in the United States. I have been advised, not directly but indirectly, by the President of the United States through his speeches, that that is what he wants done. The majority floor leader of this honorable body is a great person. The press this morning quotes him as saying this money should be expended for roads. But, when does this bill we are now considering take effect? A year from next July, and in the meantime if we retain this extra half cent on gasoline, it earns from April to next July \$500 million. Where is that going? Is it going on roads? We should be fair. I tried to get in my committee consideration for a bill introduced a year ago last January providing for \$200 million additional for interstate highways last year and this. Now, I tried to get \$200 million more for last year and this year for this interstate system because those roads are in deplorable condition and need immediate work. There was no argument against my bill except balancing the budget. We had hearings last year, a

terrific number of them, to find out what the situation was. We found that the situation was that everybody needed more and better roads. People were constantly being killed on the highways, even some murdered. Thirty-eight thousand three hundred people were killed last year, far over 300 more than the year before, and it will be more this year. That will continue until we do our job and get this money for the highways that we need.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Are there any toll roads in the gentleman's State?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Not one. We could use more money. If this bill is not going to take effect until a year from next July, then we should get something in the meantime, or else use the \$500 million that we are going to tax the people in the meantime, take it and put it where it is going to construct more and better roads.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I want to compliment the gentleman in directing the attention of the House to the disproportionate distribution of this money as it deals with the western territory, as he has previously outlined. What I would like to know is, What would be the correct answer, in the opinion of the gentleman? Should we retain it on the basis of population, area, and road miles?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Defense roads should be absolutely placed on the basis of population, area, and total miles in your State. That formula has been in effect for years and years.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Was there any other formula suggested to the committee of which the gentleman is a member as to the manner in which this should be apportioned other than 50-50 on the basis of population and on the primary fund roads?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will say this, that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads and the gentleman from New Mexico had worked very closely together until this thing came up.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. YORTY].

(Mr. YORTY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. YORTY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of today's RECORD.]

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time to point out a section of the bill which I think is surplusage under the present situation. I think on the whole the bill is a very good bill. Of course, I am for it. However, there is a provision written into this bill, on page 5, line 11, that reads as follows:

That the Secretary of Commerce shall not apportion to the States the sum authorized by this section for the fiscal year ending

June 30, 1956, unless a Federal excise tax on gasoline in the amount of not less than 2 cents per gallon is in effect on September 30, 1954; and the Secretary of Commerce shall not apportion to the States the sum authorized by this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, unless a Federal excise tax on gasoline in the amount of not less than 2 cents per gallon is in effect on September 30, 1955.

I think I understand the reasoning behind that and the reasons for that provision's being in the bill. At the time this bill was written and adopted by the very splendid Committee on Public Works, the bill continuing that excess tax of half a cent and bringing it up to 2 cents had not been voted out by the Committee on Ways and Means. Since that time that tax has been voted out—that is, a continuation of that tax of half a cent, which gives the 2-cent tax that is mentioned here. It will be passed by this body on Wednesday.

You might argue, What difference does it make then? It makes this difference: For the first time in the history of all this Federal-aid road legislation, as I understand it, such a restriction has been placed upon these allocations.

Let us bear in mind there is nothing partisan about this. This is not partisan legislation. This is a matter that has been supported uniformly by both the Democratic and the Republican Parties when they were in power. I do not think there is anything sinister or partisan about this provision under discussion, but I am apprehensive—and others who have given thought to this matter are apprehensive—of the precedent set here when we put that in the bill. Once you write that into this bill, do not forget that it is going to continue in there from now on and will become permanent legislation.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I am sure we all recognize the fact that the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi has always been fair and his honesty and integrity cannot be questioned. We are trying to do that in this legislation. We are trying to say to the traveling public in all honesty that we are going to give them the approximate amount of money that they pay in for gasoline taxes and diesel fuel. Certainly there is nothing in this legislation that makes it permanent. But we are pointing out to the other body that we want to be in a position where we can say to the States in which we have contractual obligations that we are going to live up to them as long as we have the 2 cents gasoline tax revenue. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me on that.

Mr. COLMER. Now will the gentleman from Ohio answer a question for me? If the gentleman had been assured in the premises that the one-half cent excise tax would be continued, then I would take it he would not have written this provision into the bill?

Mr. MCGREGOR. We might have had that assurance in this body, but I will say that sometimes the other body does things that we do not do here.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. What assurance is there, assuming that this bill becomes law that the Committee on Appropriations will appropriate the one-half cent that this relates to? There is no guarantee of that?

Mr. McGREGOR. I am certain that the minority whip is familiar with the rules of the House relative to authorizations which might be considered appropriations as far as roads are concerned. The Committee on Appropriations is practically bound to appropriate money called for in road authorizations because of the contractual obligations made with the various States.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is the gentleman stating that our Government is bound by the provisions of these bills and that the Committee on Appropriations should appropriate funds which have not been authorized?

Mr. McGREGOR. I am glad to be corrected. I will say that we are morally bound because of the contractual obligations that exist with the States.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will agree when the gentleman says we are morally bound. But that is a different matter than being legally bound because if what the gentleman says is correct, then we are making an appropriation which the standing committee has no power to make.

Mr. McGREGOR. I might say to my distinguished friend, there is nothing in this bill relative to appropriations that is not in the basic Highway Act of 1944, and the gentleman from Massachusetts was here at that time and helped pass that bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. The basic act of 1944 provides for authorizations.

Mr. McGREGOR. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. The bill we are now considering makes an authorization dependent upon the existence of a tax, is that not correct?

Mr. McGREGOR. We are just being honest and saying you cannot have the cake and eat it too; if you want good roads, you must pay for them.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not impugning the honesty of my friends or of the committee. The language is very plain. I am not even saying that I am going to vote against it, but I have certain doubts about the advisability of it.

Mr. McGREGOR. May I say to my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, who is so worried over this additional one-half cent tax that is going to be renewed, I hope, on Wednesday. If he wants to make a motion to strike out that one-half cent tax on Wednesday on a recommitment motion, that is his privilege. Then we can definitely decide whether we want good roads or bad roads.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts is deeply indebted to his friend, the gentleman from Ohio, for advising him as to something he can do, which the gentleman from Massachusetts is thoroughly acquainted with and knows that he can do. But let us confine ourselves to this bill. According to what the gentleman said this amounts to an appropriation, or has the effect of an appropriation.

Mr. McGREGOR. Not any more, as my distinguished friend knows, than any other authorization bill relating to roads coming from the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. McCORMACK. My dear friend fails to differentiate. This is entirely different from an ordinary authorization, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very obvious here that under the present situation we do not need this provision in the bill. My good friend, the chairman of the subcommittee, falls back on that old relief measure, that we are going to leave this to the other body to attend to. I think sometimes we ought to do a little legislating on our own over here.

Let us go back to the merits of this proposal for just a moment. It is not going to make any practical difference if this tax is continued and if this language stays in, except for the danger of the precedent that you set for the future. Once you tie it in here with this, you are going to have it continue in the bills that follow. If that is what you are going to do, and you collect 2 cents for the Federal Government, which amounts to more than these allocations, why not put it all on a Federal-aid basis, if you are going to match it dollar for dollar and that is your purpose? But again I would be opposed to that for the simple reason that I do not want this highway legislation tied down with this kind of restriction. Your administrative problems would be enormous.

For instance, take your fishing fleets, your agricultural tractors, and other farm implements, where they do not pay the tax. You would have an enormous administrative problem there in making these deductions. The Federal Government would have to go in and figure out the various deductions for these fishing fleets and agricultural implements, where the tax was not required.

I was in hopes—I do not have too much now—that my distinguished friend might see his way clear to eliminating this section. I am not so sure, if somebody else does not do it, in the consideration of the bill, that I shall not be constrained to offer an amendment to delete it.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER] is recognized for 9 minutes.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my remarks to the provisions of the bill which provide \$200 million of Federal matching funds for the interstate highway system.

There are a few basic facts about this system which should be recalled:

Its designation as interstate indicates that this is the system with which the Federal Government should be primarily concerned.

If another war should come, which, of course, we all pray will not happen, these are the highways which the Department of Defense says must do the job. Today they are the roads which are carry-

ing the load. These 40,000 miles of interstate highways comprise only 1 percent of the entire road mileage in the United States yet they carry 20 percent of all the traffic.

The evidence adduced by the committee is conclusive that this system today is totally inadequate to do the job because of this high volume and heavy traffic load. This is particularly true in the highly populated areas. It is on these interstate roads in the congested sections that the movement of traffic has been reduced to a snail's pace. It is here where the highways have deteriorated—where they are too narrow and outmoded. These are the highways that were built at the beginning of the automobile era. They now need rebuilding and replacement. It is here where the great losses are incurred—in cargo delays, in driver time loss, in added gasoline and oil consumption, in wear and tear on motor vehicles and the motoring public's nervous system.

These are some of the reasons why the McGregor bill provides for the first time a substantial sum for the interstate system. It is my personal opinion that an even greater amount of the total should be allocated to this system.

The American Association of State Highway Officials who are responsible for the roads in your State and, who on a whole know more about the road problem than any other persons in the country, have made an exhaustive study and survey with reference to the interstate system and have reached the conclusions as I have outlined them. Their study goes further and recommends what must be done to improve the interstate system. They point out that the improvement of the interstate system must be a uniform improvement throughout the entire country. It must be a uniform improvement if it is to be effective, particularly in the time of emergency. In other words, this interstate chain of roads is no stronger or effective than its weakest section.

These State highway officials have determined the approximate cost of bringing these roads up to the standard needed to meet the commercial and defense requirements of the Nation.

One of their significant findings is the fact that the cost of doing this job in the 8 most populated States is 51½ percent of the total, while the cost of all of the remaining 40 States represents 48½ percent of the total cost. Their findings further point out that in the first 8 States we find 71,500,000 of our people as against 79,200,000 in the remaining 40 States.

Then again these 8 States account for 25,700,000 motor-vehicle registrations against 27,500,000 in the remaining 40 States.

With these cogent facts before them, the State highway officials in convention assembled voted to recommend to the Congress that the money allocated for the interstate system be distributed on a population basis. The significant thing about this recommendation is the fact that 46 highway departments voted specifically for the population formula and only 2 against.

It should be further noted that each State had one vote irrespective of its size, population, or the amount contributed to the Federal Government in gasoline taxes.

It seems to me that with these facts no fair-minded person can come to a different conclusion than have our State highway officials, especially when it is known that in many instances the cost per mile of constructing these interstate highways in the industrial areas is seven times the cost in rural areas.

The McGregor bill before us provides that only one-half of the two hundred million be distributed under the population formula; that the remaining one hundred million be distributed under the old formula.

It is obvious from what I have said that if the interstate system is to be improved uniformly and the job properly done all of the two hundred million should be distributed under the population formula as the State highway officials recommend. Yet there are some who selfishly insist that we should ignore the population formula completely and distribute this entire two hundred million on the old basis. If we do this those States where the cost of improvement is 51½ percent, get only 34¼ percent of the funds while those States where the cost is only 48½ percent get 67¼ of the money.

[Mr. HALLECK addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to commend the gentleman for making a very excellent statement. It is quite evident that as a member of this great committee he has paid close attention to the testimony before the committee and made a great study of it and he is, better than that and more than that, expressing so well and for the education of all of us the solutions to the problems that confronted the committee.

Mr. SCHERER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8127) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8127, with Mr. NICHOLSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill presented to the House today is the result not of brief hearings on the part of the Committee on Public Works or its subcommittee on roads but is the result of long and extended hearings that lasted more than 3 months last year and many days this year. We think it is a good bill. There may be some provisions in it that some Members of the House and some members of the committee are not entirely satisfied with.

But, upon the whole this is a good bill and provides more money for highways than any highway-aid bill ever presented to Congress.

I think the great problem before the American people today is not how to build the best automobiles in the world, because we are doing that, but the great problem which presents itself to us in the House today is to find some means of providing adequate facilities on which to operate them. The Bureau of Public Roads informs us that we now have 55 million registered motor vehicles in our country, 1 for every 3 people in the United States. More than that, we are adding to that number about 3 million new cars annually. The industry provides about 6 million new cars every year, while 3 million cars leave the roads each year because of time and travel; in other words, they become old, obsolete, and worn out. In the next 2 years we will have 60 million cars traveling the highways of this country. More than that, we are told that we aggregate about one-half trillion miles of travel every year. The people who own automobiles use their cars more than they did 10 years ago. They travel more miles; they go longer distances; they use the car more often, and we are burning up about 40 billion gallons of gasoline annually. I know of no people on the face of the earth who are more dependent upon their motor transportation facilities for their daily needs or when the ownership of motor vehicles have become such an important factor in the lives and welfare of the people, as here in the United States. So, I refer once more to the problem that faces this Congress and the public officials of this country, namely, to provide adequate facilities to operate the enormous number of cars that travel the highways of our land.

There has been some criticism found with one or two of the provisions. This bill provides \$225 million more in matching money than the previous bill which was passed by this Congress two years ago. It has been the policy of the Congress to pass a road bill every 2 years. This bill provides for the fiscal years 1956 and 1957. The money for the fiscal years 1954-55 has already been provided for and has been allocated to the States. Some argument has been presented that this bill ought to be set up a year sooner. I heard it discussed in the well of the House. I doubt very much, if you did that, whether the States could match

it in time to take advantage of it; in other words, we have a road policy in this land that started back in 1916, a Federal-State highway system. Upon the whole that system has worked admirably for more than 35 years. Why should we change it? Why should we change it when it is time-tested and found not wanting? I think it would be a great mistake. Even the suggestion that the Federal Bureau of Roads be abolished and the Federal Government withdraw from collecting taxes on gasoline suggested by the governors' conference I think would be a tragic mistake, because you would have no coordinating agency to integrate this vast system of highways that has been built up since 1916. Why, more than 300 years ago it was discovered that "the easy conveyance of men and goods from place to place was one of the three things necessary to make a nation great and strong." Good roads manifested itself to the people of this world even 2,000 years ago. The Romans believed in good roads and they built a road that has lasted more than 2,000 years. The Greeks believed in good roads, and 300 years ago an English authority came forth and said that the easy conveyance of men and goods from place to place is one of the three essentials which make a nation great and strong. That is the subject we are dealing with today on the floor of this House, the subject of transportation.

I am not going into the question of the technical points of the bill, because, may I say to the House, in justice to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR], that he has devoted much time, thought, and energy to the question of good roads. It was from his subcommittee that the bill was presented to the full committee and adopted by us unanimously.

The opposition presented here about this half-cent gas tax I think is a tempest in a teapot. Perhaps the language is unusual, but if the tax bill which will come to this floor next Wednesday had been passed before this bill came to the floor you would have heard no discussion about it and there would have been no necessity for putting the language in the bill. I am satisfied that the half-cent gas tax should be continued, and I believe it will be continued.

I am not going to take any more time at this point.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Will the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works yield me a moment in order that I may confess that there are certain provisions in this bill I do not understand? Knowing how careful and capable the gentleman is in delving into these subjects in his committee, I should like him to explain, in order that I may vote intelligently on the provisions of this bill, first, what is meant by the Federal-aid primary highway system. Is that within the States alone?

Mr. DONDERO. I trust the gentleman will defer his question because I have tried to avoid discussing such ques-

tions, leaving them to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads [Mr. McGREGOR], which committee practically prepared this bill.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I am willing to wait if the gentleman will give me time to ask that question later.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I will first state to the committee that I am appearing as a substitute today. The absence of our distinguished colleague from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], ranking member of the Roads Subcommittee, was caused by the tragic incident that happened here last Monday. There were two members of our committee who received injury then, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS]. I am happy to report to the committee today that both Mr. FALLON and Mr. DAVIS of this committee have been able to return home and their conditions have been reported as satisfactory.

In spite of the combined efforts of the local governments, the State governments, and the Federal Government, we have not been able to settle the tremendous and urgent road problem existing in this country today. You will recall that we have 3 million miles of roads in our country. It is estimated that to put all our roads in repair and bring them up to present-day standards it would require an appropriation of from \$35 to \$40 billions. The number of vehicles has increased far in excess of the building program that has been carried on throughout the country.

The principal section is section 1, dealing with the traditional recognized highway program, the primary, urban, secondary, or so-called farm-to-market roads. This amount of \$550 million provided under existing law has been increased to \$600 million. There has been some change in the administration of the secondary-road program. It establishes the elimination of the rigid requirements that heretofore have been required of local governments in the construction of secondary roads to meet certain criteria and certain standards and certain specifications. The provision of that part of the bill is somewhat distasteful to me. However, there still remains the right of the Secretary of Commerce to veto any standards or specifications that do not meet requirements. There has been a contention throughout the land that we need to relax those high standards which have been imposed heretofore and give the local governments more opportunity to have their say as to what type and what character of roads they should construct. I have always been of the opinion that we have a firm obligation to see that the Federal Government's tax dollars are being wisely invested, and, even though there might have been some complaints, it has served a most useful purpose.

In section 1 we also find a 25-percent interchange of funds that has been made retroactive to the act of 1952.

The most controversial section of the bill is section 2, dealing with the interstate system. The last act we passed in

1952 provided for \$25 million to be spent on the principal or main arterial highways throughout the country known as the defense highways. That road system found its life in the act of 1944. It places a limitation of 40,000 miles of roads in the interstate system. So far we have had designated 37,000 miles of the interstate system. It carries the heavy load of the traffic index figures. We are increasing the former amount to \$175 million to be made available in the fiscal year 1956-57 for the construction of the interstate system. Heretofore the interstate system has been on a 50-50 matching program, 50 percent being furnished by the Federal Government and 50 percent by the local and State governments. We have increased Federal participation to 60-40 percent. We have changed the formula of \$100 million from the traditional matching basis that we have used in the past to a population basis. The other \$100 million is to follow the same matching formula that we have had in the primary and other road systems. This represents a compromise between the urban voices and that of the rural States.

In my own State we would be most happy to have the traditional formula written, based upon the three ingredients that have been recognized historically in the writing of the roads bill. Unfortunately, we did not have sufficient strength, we did not have the urge nor the facilities to write into this bill everything that would be suitable to my people or suitable to all the people in the other States. So we agreed that one-half of the total amount would be based on a population formula and the other \$100 million would be based upon the formula we have used in the past.

There is a great deal of contention about the continuation of the one-half cent gasoline tax. I assure you this is no effort on the part of the Committee on Public Works to trespass upon the sovereignty and the authority of the Committee on Ways and Means. But with an increase of \$175 million it was necessary to have some agreement and some voice of concert that we would have available in 1956 and 1957 sufficient moneys to pay for the increases made in the bill.

There is a great deal of uneasiness about this proposal. You will recall that in the discussion with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] the very question was raised as to whether or not the normal relationship existing between an authorization and an appropriation would prevail in making funds available for the construction of roads. The Committee on Appropriations has recognized that this authorization gives rise to a moral obligation that when the contracts are made between the Bureau of Public Roads and a State highway department, they could then proceed with the planning and the expenditures of local funds in obtaining rights-of-way, a condition precedent to carrying out its contractual relations.

This bill recognizes, as we have in the past, that within 2 years the State high-

way departments of the various States would have credits of moneys that were not used in a single year. So I do not conceive nor do I believe that this provision in the bill is as serious as the objectors find it to be.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I wanted to inquire of the gentleman whether or not he knew of any precedent in previous legislation for adopting the 60-40 matching fund basis rather than the 50-50 basis. It is the first time it has come to my attention.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The 60-40 formula is based upon several reasons, the principal one being the tremendous cost of building the interstate system. In the State of Rhode Island for example, it is estimated that on the interstate system the cost would be in excess of \$2 million a mile. To take care of 4- and 6-lane highways such as these, it is necessary that we have huge and large expenditures to construct that type of road.

Second, the ability of the State to match these funds has been most difficult for a number of States. As an inducement to the States to carry on the construction of an interstate system it was necessary, in the opinion of the committee, to provide an increase in Federal participation.

I, for one, along with several other members of the committee, would like to have seen the formula changed to 75-25. Our views, however, did not prevail, and that too was a compromise figure.

Mr. KEATING. Does the gentleman know whether or not we have in the past adopted such a matching basis? My only experience has been with a 50-50 basis. I am wondering if the gentleman has additional information on that.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I do not recall in a single instance when the matching ratio has been that high on the four principal categories of roads.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. I have been somewhat concerned about the provision in the bill for the diversion of 25 percent from one purpose to another. Is it the intention of the committee that funds appropriated for urban roads might be diverted to rural roads or that funds appropriated for rural roads might be diverted to the building of city streets?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Not in excess of 25 percent; and that 25 percent provision was written in, in order that there should be some versatility of effort on the part of State highway departments to meet their State's needs. It is hard to anticipate this far in advance the particular needs of an individual State.

Mr. EVINS. I do not remember that flexibility in such legislation before. Funds have been appropriated for a particular purpose and they have been used for that purpose.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Yes; they have the 25 percent formula in existing law.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. I want to say in reply to the distinguished gentleman from New York that the act of 1941 carried a different formula than the 50-50 matching provision.

Mr. Chairman, I also wish to take advantage of this opportunity to extend my thanks and appreciation to the gentleman from Alabama for the distinguished service and assistance he has given us on this bill and legislation.

(Mr. JONES of Alabama asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(On request of Mr. McGREGOR and by unanimous consent the remarks of Mr. FALLON appear at this point.)

[Mr. FALLON'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 27 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR], chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works, and the author of the bill before us.

(Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I want to pay my respects not only to the Subcommittee on Roads but also to the full Committee on Public Works. They have worked hard and diligently. This is a bill that came out of our committee by a unanimous vote. There was no politics; we considered all of the areas which it is our privilege to represent; and, as so ably stated by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, this is a compromise measure. There are many things in the bill that, possibly, if I were writing it for the 17th Congressional District of Ohio or for the State of Ohio, I would have changed to coincide with the Ohio viewpoint; but all of us in representing our respective districts and States recognized this as a national matter and thus agreed on a compromise bill which we all accepted. I want to say to the members of the committee that I certainly appreciate the splendid cooperation they have given me.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to read a statement which was presented to me by one of our colleagues on the committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS]; and I also ask, Mr. Chairman, that after this statement our colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], who is the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Roads, be granted permission to insert his remarks ahead of those of the gentleman from Ohio. Both of these gentlemen are confined to the hospital for reason known to all of us.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. This is a statement of the gentleman from Tennessee:

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Public Works, I rise to support House Resolution 8127. This measure is necessary and should

be enacted into law to provide Federal-aid authorizations for orderly continuation of the highway construction program for an additional 2-year period. The amounts authorized by this bill will become available to the States during the fiscal years 1956 and 1957, on a matching basis.

The Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works conducted a complete study of the highway problem, as well as the needs for a new construction and numerous other factors all relating to highways. As a result of the factual material furnished to the committee by Federal department representatives, State highway officials, road builders, automobile associations, truckers, the motorist, and many persons in private industry as well as others, we were convinced that the highway problem was one which demanded top priority.

We were informed that \$800 million was the minimum annual Federal-aid authorization which would be required to accomplish most urgently needed construction work and that such a program would have to be kept in effect for at least 20 years to keep pace with the problems.

I believe the committee in reporting favorably on H. R. 8127 is attempting to be realistic, consistent with the economy of the Nation, and is meeting head on the challenge which the highway problem presents.

In authorizing \$800 million for Federal aid to highways for each of the fiscal years 1956 and 1957, we have increased the amount authorized in the 1952 act by \$225 million per fiscal year.

I believe the provision in section 1 of the bill, which permits up to 25 percent of the amount apportioned to any State in any year for primary, secondary, and urban systems, respectively, to be transferred from one system to either of the others, is a progressive measure and allows greater latitude in administering the funds which will accomplish better results on a more satisfactory basis. This same observation may be made with respect to the second proviso in section 1, for that will also assure more perfect cooperation between the States and the Bureau of Public Roads with respect to secondary roads, and should prove mutually advantageous.

The committee should be commended for the constructive action which it has taken in this bill with respect to two vital and somewhat controversial measures. In section 9, it has directed the Secretary of Commerce to make a study in cooperation with the State highway departments and other parties in interest relative to the problems posed by necessary relocation and reconstruction of public utilities services resulting from authorized highway improvements. Among other things, such a study is to include a review and financial analysis of existing relationships between the State highway departments and affected utilities of all types, and a review of the various State statutes regulating existing relationships, to the end that a full and informative report may be made to the President for transmittal to the Congress of the United States not later than February 1, 1955.

In section 12 the committee has given recognition to the need for a great highway to traverse the Mississippi Valley from Canada to the Gulf and has authorized the expenditure of \$250,000 from general administrative funds to expedite the planning and coordination of this Great River Road.

The purposes and objectives of this legislation are reasonable and urgently required. These authorizations are needed not only as part of the national defense program but also the national highway safety program.

I earnestly and sincerely support this bill and respectfully urge its passage.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, it is a privilege and a pleasure for me to incorporate in the RECORD at this point the statement of the Honorable CLIF-

FORD DAVIS, a member of our subcommittee and the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. Chairman, for the first time in history, the bill before you, H. R. 8127 authorizes appropriations for Federal-aid highways and for highway work in the national forests, national parks and parkways, and Indian reservations in the approximate amount of the Federal road user tax on motor fuels. The total of \$875 million authorizations carried in the bill compares with the approximately \$905 million collected by the Federal Government on gasoline and diesel fuel in the fiscal year 1953.

There are several important features in the bill which I shall describe more in detail in a moment. These are:

First. Provision for a greatly enlarged authorization for the improvement of the national system of interstate highways.

Second. Provision for the transfer of funds between different categories to provide a flexibility necessary to meet highway needs which vary from State to State.

Third. The transfer to the State highway departments of much greater authority to handle the local problems involved in the farm-to-market road program.

The bill provides for carrying forward the time-proven pattern of cooperation between the Federal Government operating through the Bureau of Public Roads and the several States operating through their respective State highway departments with a few changes which experience has indicated are desirable.

The bill would authorize \$600 million for each of the fiscal years 1956 and 1957, divided among the three categories of projects established initially in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944, as follows:

Two hundred and seventy million dollars, or 45 percent, for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system.

One hundred and eighty million dollars, or 30 percent, for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system.

One hundred and fifty million dollars, or 25 percent, for projects on the Federal-aid primary system in urban areas.

An additional \$200 million annually is authorized for improvements on the interstate system. This system, which was set up through cooperative effort of the State highway departments and the Bureau of Public Roads under the direction of Congress, is limited to 40,000 miles. It represents the most important highways in the primary system. It is important not only to our peacetime economy but is vital to our national defense, consisting as it does of highways of the greatest strategic importance. The rural portions of this system, although comprising only slightly more than 1 percent of all the highways in the country, carry 20 percent or more of all the rural traffic. It has been well said that this system, together with other important mileage, is an integral part of our industrial assembly line. It provides an indispensable service.

The approximate amounts which each State would receive from the \$800 million authorized are shown in the table which I submit for the RECORD:

Approximate apportionment of Federal-aid highway funds pursuant to H. R. 8127

State	Federal-aid				Interstate			Total (\$500,000,000)
	Primary (\$270,000,000)	Secondary (\$180,000,000)	Urban (\$150,000,000)	Subtotal (\$600,000,000)	Population ¹ (\$100,000,000)	Sec. 21 ² (\$100,000,000)	Subtotal (\$200,000,000)	
Alabama.....	\$5,761,000	\$4,465,000	\$1,938,000	\$12,164,000	\$1,876,000	\$2,155,000	\$4,031,000	\$16,195,000
Arizona.....	4,038,000	2,750,000	575,000	7,363,000	735,000	1,507,000	2,242,000	9,605,000
Arkansas.....	4,495,000	3,597,000	827,000	8,919,000	1,170,000	1,680,000	2,850,000	11,769,000
California.....	12,393,000	6,351,000	13,145,000	31,922,000	6,487,000	4,652,000	11,139,000	43,061,000
Colorado.....	4,858,000	3,215,000	1,229,000	9,332,000	812,000	1,514,000	2,626,000	11,958,000
Connecticut.....	1,751,000	882,000	2,864,000	5,497,000	1,230,000	658,000	1,888,000	7,385,000
Delaware.....	1,323,000	882,000	303,000	2,508,000	735,000	490,000	1,225,000	3,733,000
Florida.....	4,386,000	2,867,000	2,652,000	9,905,000	1,698,000	1,643,000	3,341,000	13,246,000
Georgia.....	6,682,000	5,103,000	2,156,000	13,941,000	2,111,000	2,499,000	4,610,000	18,551,000
Idaho.....	3,328,000	2,341,000	285,000	5,954,000	735,000	1,242,000	1,977,000	7,931,000
Illinois.....	10,401,000	5,664,000	10,344,000	26,409,000	5,339,000	3,901,000	9,240,000	35,649,000
Iowa.....	6,409,000	4,418,000	3,538,000	14,365,000	2,411,000	2,399,000	4,810,000	19,175,000
Kansas.....	6,520,000	4,772,000	1,756,000	13,048,000	1,606,000	2,436,000	4,042,000	17,090,000
Kentucky.....	6,552,000	4,587,000	1,390,000	12,529,000	1,168,000	2,446,000	3,614,000	16,143,000
Louisiana.....	4,977,000	4,131,000	1,536,000	10,644,000	1,804,000	1,863,000	3,667,000	14,311,000
Maine.....	4,207,000	3,045,000	2,168,000	9,420,000	1,644,000	1,576,000	3,220,000	12,640,000
Maryland.....	2,265,000	1,621,000	618,000	4,504,000	735,000	847,000	1,582,000	6,086,000
Massachusetts.....	2,374,000	1,451,000	2,510,000	6,335,000	1,436,000	892,000	2,328,000	8,663,000
Michigan.....	3,429,000	1,273,000	6,156,000	10,858,000	2,874,000	1,293,000	4,167,000	15,025,000
Minnesota.....	8,379,000	5,113,000	6,884,000	20,376,000	3,904,000	3,141,000	7,045,000	27,421,000
Mississippi.....	7,002,000	4,943,000	2,408,000	14,353,000	1,828,000	2,617,000	4,445,000	18,798,000
Missouri.....	4,826,000	4,021,000	819,000	9,666,000	1,335,000	1,804,000	3,139,000	12,805,000
Montana.....	7,870,000	5,325,000	3,643,000	16,838,000	2,423,000	2,943,000	5,366,000	22,204,000
Nebraska.....	5,423,000	3,730,000	348,000	9,501,000	735,000	2,023,000	2,758,000	12,259,000
Nevada.....	5,264,000	3,733,000	868,000	9,865,000	812,000	1,965,000	2,777,000	12,642,000
New Hampshire.....	3,486,000	2,330,000	113,000	5,929,000	735,000	1,300,000	2,035,000	7,964,000
New Jersey.....	1,323,000	882,000	438,000	2,643,000	735,000	490,000	1,225,000	3,868,000
New Mexico.....	3,491,000	1,175,000	6,475,000	11,141,000	2,963,000	1,316,000	4,279,000	15,420,000
New York.....	4,389,000	3,015,000	485,000	7,889,000	735,000	1,638,000	2,373,000	10,262,000
North Carolina.....	12,691,000	5,085,000	19,770,000	37,546,000	9,087,000	4,775,000	13,862,000	51,408,000
North Dakota.....	6,690,000	5,715,000	1,901,000	14,306,000	2,459,000	2,504,000	4,963,000	19,299,000
Ohio.....	3,917,000	2,844,000	250,000	7,011,000	735,000	1,401,000	2,196,000	9,207,000
Oklahoma.....	9,415,000	5,727,000	8,559,000	23,701,000	4,869,000	3,531,000	8,400,000	32,101,000
Oregon.....	5,778,000	4,137,000	1,616,000	11,531,000	1,369,000	2,159,000	3,528,000	15,059,000
Pennsylvania.....	4,616,000	3,226,000	1,186,000	9,028,000	932,000	1,725,000	2,657,000	11,685,000
Rhode Island.....	10,597,000	6,306,000	11,197,000	28,100,000	6,433,000	3,980,000	10,413,000	38,513,000
South Carolina.....	1,323,000	882,000	1,057,000	3,262,000	735,000	490,000	1,225,000	4,487,000
South Dakota.....	3,635,000	3,010,000	1,017,000	7,662,000	1,297,000	1,361,000	2,658,000	10,320,000
Tennessee.....	4,217,000	3,012,000	287,000	7,516,000	735,000	1,573,000	2,308,000	9,824,000
Texas.....	5,851,000	4,560,000	2,139,000	12,550,000	2,017,000	2,189,000	4,206,000	16,756,000
Utah.....	17,513,000	11,727,000	7,086,000	36,326,000	4,725,000	6,548,000	11,273,000	47,599,000
Vermont.....	3,104,000	2,053,000	627,000	5,784,000	735,000	1,159,000	1,894,000	7,678,000
Virginia.....	1,323,000	882,000	230,000	2,435,000	735,000	490,000	1,225,000	3,660,000
Washington.....	5,128,000	3,986,000	2,306,000	11,420,000	2,034,000	1,920,000	3,954,000	15,374,000
West Virginia.....	4,463,000	2,982,000	2,232,000	9,677,000	1,458,000	1,670,000	3,128,000	12,805,000
Wisconsin.....	2,944,000	2,563,000	963,000	6,470,000	1,229,000	1,103,000	2,332,000	8,802,000
Wyoming.....	6,378,000	4,450,000	2,896,000	13,724,000	2,105,000	2,386,000	4,491,000	18,215,000
Hawaii.....	3,367,000	2,282,000	161,000	5,810,000	735,000	1,256,000	1,991,000	7,801,000
District of Columbia.....	1,323,000	882,000	497,000	2,702,000				2,702,000
Puerto Rico.....	1,323,000	882,000	1,278,000	3,483,000	735,000	490,000	1,225,000	4,708,000
	1,402,000	1,465,000	1,271,000	4,138,000				4,138,000

¹ Apportioned according to total population with minimum of 3/4 of 1 percent.² Apportioned according to sec. 21 of Federal Highway Act—1/3 area, 1/3 total population, and 1/3 post road mileage, with minimum of 1/2 of 1 percent.

No one can dispute the urgent need for modernizing our highway system. Testimony submitted to the committee by the State highway officials indicated that the estimated cost of eliminating the deficiencies on the approved Federal-aid systems of 673,000 miles amounted to approximately \$35 billion. This estimate is larger than similar estimates made in prior years. The increase in the estimated cost of modernizing this mileage shows that under our present rate of expenditure we have been losing ground. This has happened in spite of an expenditure of \$3,600,000,000 on the Federal-aid systems in the past few years.

A look at the increase in automobile registrations will help to explain this situation. Ten years ago, in 1944, 30,479,000 motor vehicles were registered. The number of motor vehicles using our highways has steadily increased at such an unprecedented rate that in the year just closed more than 55 million motor vehicles were in service. This is an increase in a 10-year period of 80 percent.

These statistics, however, do not tell the full story. Many owners of automobiles are using them more and more each year for both recreation and daily activities. We are truly a nation on wheels. Over night our whole population could be moved from one place to

another with less than an average of three persons per car—that is, it could if we had the highways to accommodate our motor vehicles.

Now a word of explanation as to the new features in the bill which experience has indicated are desirable. The \$600 million authorized for work on the three categories of projects—primary, secondary, and urban, which might be referred to as the regular Federal-aid highway program—is apportioned in the same manner among the States as provided in the 1944 act. To provide greater flexibility in the use of these funds to meet varying conditions encountered in different States, there is provision in the bill that would permit the transfer between these 3 classes of projects to the extent of not more than 25 percent when such transfer is requested by a State highway department and approved by the Secretary of Commerce as being in the public interest.

Such a provision has been recommended by the State highway officials several times in the past in connection with consideration of previous legislation, and the committee is now convinced that such a provision is necessary to provide the flexibility necessary for a State highway department to make the most beneficial use of Federal funds appor-

tioned to it in meeting its particular highway needs.

Another provision would give to the State highway departments much greater authority in handling their secondary road program. Following the apportionment of the secondary funds to the States and the programming of projects, the State highway departments would carry on the secondary program without the necessity of referring the plans to the Bureau of Public Roads for approval and without detail inspection by engineers of the Bureau of Public Roads as is required by the present law. Payment of the Federal share of the cost of secondary projects would be made on certification by the State highway department that the plans, design, and construction of such projects were in accord with the standards and procedures applicable to such projects which had previously been approved and following a final inspection by the Bureau engineers to see that the work had been performed.

This provision is intended to place back in the States the handling of the local problems involved in the building of farm-to-market roads and would relieve the Bureau of Public Roads of many administrative and engineering responsibilities imposed by present law. It is my belief that this provision will pro-

vide a pattern of cooperation between the State highway departments and counties, or other local units, comparable to that which has been built up through the years and which would continue between the Bureau of Public Roads and the State highway departments on the primary and urban systems. This desirable transfer of authority to the State highway departments will in no way affect the requirement that the States or counties maintain the projects after construction. This maintenance requirement will insure the protection of the Federal interest in these projects and the public of continuing satisfactory highway service through proper maintenance.

The committee gave the most serious consideration to the apportionment formula for the \$200 million authorized for the interstate system. The State highway officials association had repeatedly recommended that these funds be apportioned on the basis of population rather than the formula for primary roads which gives equal weight to the three factors of population, area, and mileage of post roads. To provide a larger apportionment to States with sparse population, a floor of three-fourths of 1 percent was recommended as a part of the population formula. The reason for apportioning these funds on a population basis, which was stressed before the committee, was that it would permit reasonably uniform progress in removing the deficiencies from the interstate system in all of the States. After extended consideration, the committee decided to provide that one-half the funds authorized for the interstate system be apportioned on the traditional primary formula and one-half on population with a floor of three-fourths of 1 percent. This is a good compromise because testimony before the committee indicated that the cost of removing the deficiencies on the interstate system are about equally divided between urban and rural areas and one-half the interstate funds would be apportioned under the bill on a formula similar to that covering the apportionment of urban funds and the remaining half in the same manner as primary funds.

Another departure from current practice is a provision which would make the Federal share of the cost of improving the interstate system 60 percent and the States' share 40 percent, with the sliding scale applying in the public land States. Strong support was presented to the committee for increasing the Federal share above the traditional 50-50 matching ratio because of the vital importance of this system to the Nation as a whole. The State Highway Officials Association and the American Automobile Association each recommended that the Federal share be increased to 75 percent. Other witnesses appearing before the committee thought that the regular 50-50 matching should be continued. Recognizing the great importance of the interstate system and the importance of expediting its modernization and that a larger Federal share would serve as an inducement to proceed more rapidly with the costly improvements on the inter-

state system, the committee included the 60-40 matching provision.

The apportionment and availability of the interstate funds is conditioned on the continuation of the 2-cent Federal gasoline tax. A reduction of one-half cent in this tax would reduce the income from this source by an amount in excess of the \$200,000,000 being provided for the interstate system. To make this program self-supporting from the motor fuel tax revenue it is necessary that this tax be retained at 2 cents per gallon.

The bill also provides for continuation of present programs of highway work in Federal reservations for each of the fiscal years 1956 and 1957 as follows:

Forest highways.....	\$22, 500, 000
Forest development roads and trails.....	22, 500, 000
National park roads.....	10, 000, 000
Parkways.....	10, 000, 000
Indian reservation roads.....	10, 000, 000
Total.....	75, 000, 000

Because of the great lag between appropriations and authorizations for forest highways, the bill proposes to cancel the authorization of \$22,500,000 authorized for the fiscal year 1955. Such a cancellation will still leave nearly \$21 million authorized but not appropriated. There is precedent for such cancellation action since a similar situation of lagging appropriations existed when the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948 was under consideration and the authorization for 1948 was canceled.

No new authorization is contained in H. R. 8127 for continuing work on the Inter-American Highway and the so-called Rama Road in Nicaragua. However, on recommendation of the Department of State the unappropriated balances of the funds heretofore authorized to be appropriated for such purposes are continued for the fiscal years 1955 and 1956. This will provide for continuing this work at an acceptable rate.

A number of witnesses appeared before the committee urging that the cost of adjusting public utilities in connection with the construction of Federal-aid projects be made reimbursable from Federal funds regardless of current State laws and franchise provisions. The committee recognizes that assumption of the costs involved in making adjustments necessitated by highway projects imposes a serious burden on many utilities, particularly the smaller ones. The committee concluded, however, that before recommending such a step it should have the benefit of a factual study including a review and financial analysis of existing relationships between the State highway departments and affected utilities of all types and so has directed the Secretary of Commerce to make such a study in cooperation with the State highway departments and other parties and interests relative to the problems posed by the necessary relocation and reconstruction of public utilities resulting from Federal-aid highway improvements.

Under present legislation there is no specific provision for the improvement of extensions of the secondary system in urban areas. To correct this situation

section 11 provides for Federal participation in the improvement of such extensions with urban funds. This is a very desirable provision. In my opinion it might be well also to permit the improvement of such extensions with primary funds.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to use not to exceed \$250,000 from General Administrative funds for the purpose of expediting the planning and coordination of a continuous Great River Road which would traverse the Mississippi Valley from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico. Such Mississippi Valley Parkway has been proposed in accordance with the plan recommended in the joint report submitted to Congress November 28, 1951, by the Secretaries of Commerce and Interior. The committee feels that such authorization would provide an incentive to the 10 States bordering the Mississippi toward the developing of such parkway in line with established Federal-aid procedures. During recent years the committee has had before it numerous bills to provide Federal authorizations and assistance toward this project.

In concluding my description of the bill I wish to reemphasize that for the first time in history, through the enactment of H. R. 8127, we will be making available for highway work approximately the amount of the Federal tax on motor fuels.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I want to ask the question that I propounded of the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee as to the meaning or significance of the words "private highway" system. Does that include the roads within each respective State?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I may say that the gentleman's inference is correct. The primary highway system is a network of principal highways comprising the Federal-aid primary-highway systems in the States. Since World War II, 45 percent of each year's authorization has gone to this particular system.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Is the percentage allocated this year on a par or is it the same as the pattern we have followed every year previously?

Mr. MCGREGOR. That is correct. The bill makes no change whatsoever in the primary, urban, and secondary systems; 45 percent goes to the primary, 30 percent goes to the secondary, and 25 percent to the urban.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. It is noted here that \$150 million is for projects on Federal-aid and primary highways in urban areas and \$200 million is set aside for interstate roads concerning urban areas. Why is not the \$200 million tied in with the \$150 million?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I might say that under the interstate system we have 40,000 miles, and that 40,000 miles comprises primarily urban and, I expect, a little secondary. But the 40,000 miles is the main routes of arterial travel from one section of the country to the other, and that is really under the cate-

gory of a military road. We have allocated \$200 million for the interstate system. We have changed the formula on that. Instead of a 50-50 matching clause, which is applicable to the primary, secondary, and urban on the interstate system, we call it 60-40, which is 60 percent put up by the Federal Government and 40 percent put up by the States. We do that to add a little incentive for the States to hurry the so-called interstate system, because it is a part of our defense program. This defense program is quite mobile, and I feel that the interstate system is more of a Federal responsibility than it is a State responsibility.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I thank the distinguished gentleman of the subcommittee for the information he gave me. Then the sum total of these figures would be \$800 million?

Mr. MCGREGOR. The matching money is \$800 million. The actual total of the bill proper is \$875 million. The \$75 million represents forest highways, parks, and so forth.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. All of this is to be allocated to the improvement and construction of new roads; am I correct?

Mr. MCGREGOR. That is correct. If I may interrupt the gentleman, this \$875 million is the highest amount of money ever allocated or authorized by the Federal Government for roads. The actual return from the 2-cent fuel gas tax this year is approximately \$906 million. We are authorizing \$875 million of this amount. We are leaving approximately \$30 million as a cushion fund for an emergency that might arise.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I just want to add to what I have heretofore stated, that I am sure the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee is familiar with the statement the President of the United States made recently before the National Safety Council. He described the maiming and the slaughter of thousands of individuals killed on the highways, and the loss of property. My only regret, Mr. Chairman, is that the figure just mentioned is not four times as big as that which this bill calls for. I think it is one of the most worthy, one of the most outstanding, one of the most necessary causes to which we can contribute our funds that has ever been conjured up since I have been in this House.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, because I know of his intense interest in this problem. I might say that on page A1683 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD you will find the apportionment of Federal-aid highway funds as it compares with existing law as to each of the segments of the highway program.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. One of the subjects discussed on the floor during the consideration of the rule on this bill was the question of linkage between the tax on gasoline and the amount appropriated. Now, I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if he is an advocate

of linkage between the proceeds of the gas tax and the appropriations.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I might say to my distinguished friend from Iowa that there is really no linkage in this particular bill. We are saying to the people, "If you want good highways, you give us the money that you have been paying in, the 2-cent gas tax, and we will assure you by the passage of this legislation that we will put approximately the same amount of money on roads." Now, being absolutely honest and sincere, we are saying "you can either have good roads or you can vote out the one-half cent liquid fuel tax and not have them." We have no jurisdiction over the continuation of the half-cent tax, and I was highly pleased when the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, Congressman REED, made the statement that we were not interfering with operation of his committee. It is imperative that the 2-cent gas tax be continued and not be permitted to expire for the revenue therefrom will bring in approximately \$910 million. With this fund available, we can assure you that you will have \$875 million spent on roads. We are not linking it. The revenue from gas and diesel oil all goes into the general fund of the Treasury. Ninety percent of the American people believe that the gas taxes which they pay are all going into roads.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Is it fair to say to people who inquire of me that this is not a linkage bill?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I would say to my friend from Iowa, in my opinion, it is not entirely a linkage bill. If it were a direct linkage bill we would be interfering with the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, or at least that question could be raised. There has been a great debate here on whether or not we should continue the one-half cent tax. You will have an opportunity to vote on that Wednesday—for it is part of the tax bill.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That is in connection with the tax bill?

Mr. MCGREGOR. That is right. It is in the tax bill, I am told. If they want to argue whether or not we should continue the tax bill, that is the time to debate it. We are saying here, if you do continue the tax, we will give approximately that amount of money to the road program. If you do not continue it, we cannot, because we just have so much money. This one-half cent represents approximately \$225 million. We cannot enter into contractual obligations with the various States and then have that \$225 million taken from us.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I may say to the gentleman that as a member of the Commission on Inter-Governmental Relations this subject of Federal aid to highways has been one of the subjects which is under current consideration.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I recognize the gentleman is a member of that Commission and doing a splendid job.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The Commission is presently having under consideration a special report with reference to Federal aid for highways. That was in the background of my thinking in asking these questions.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Please remember that this is not permanent legislation. The Congress can change its mind. But one thing we are doing, we are saying to the other body that when this piece of legislation goes over there they cannot do what some of us think they want to do, which is to take out the half-cent tax and still have good roads.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I think the gentleman should also point out that that half cent brings in about \$225 million a year. If that half cent is not continued, it means the income from that gas tax is that much less. In this bill we are increasing the amount to the States \$225 million. It makes a spread of \$450 million.

Mr. MCGREGOR. The gentleman's figures are correct.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. NELSON. Do I correctly understand that the gentleman from Ohio means to say that the Committee on Public Works confines itself in making appropriations for public roads solely to the revenue received from the gas tax?

Mr. MCGREGOR. Indeed not. We are not changing the existing tax law. If we were, we would say that it would be earmarked specifically for interstate roads. In no place in this legislation are we saying that we are earmarking any funds. It all goes into the General Treasury. But we are saying that we cannot give you good roads and then allow you to take one-half cent of the gasoline tax away from us.

Mr. NELSON. The gentleman's committee has made an appropriation of some \$200 million for interstate highways. I understand from the address of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER], when he spoke on the rule, that the committee considers it a primary responsibility of the Federal Government to develop the interstate highway system.

Mr. MCGREGOR. We do consider the interstate system more of a Federal responsibility because of its military value and its possible expensive and rigid specifications?

Mr. NELSON. Yet, in this bill you appropriate \$600 million for intrastate highways without any limitation, but you place an express limitation on interstate highways that the money shall not be apportioned or spent unless the gas tax continues at 2 cents.

Mr. MCGREGOR. We have not changed the formula in the primary, secondary, or urban systems.

Mr. NELSON. I am talking about your limitation upon interstate highways. You have an express limitation that the money shall not be apportioned by the Secretary of Commerce unless the gas tax continues at 2 cents.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Again I say to my friend, we are just saying truthfully, if we do not have the money, we cannot build the roads.

Mr. NELSON. I have gathered from the debate, and I have listened to it very

carefully, the primary purpose of the linkage between the \$200 million and the 2-cent gas tax is to get the excise tax through the other body; is that correct?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I would not think so. The other body can do as they please with the excise-tax bill. If my friend wants to take off the one-half cent, he will have that privilege next Wednesday by making such a motion.

Mr. NELSON. Your friend has no desire to take off the one-half-cent tax, but he does oppose the linkage of the one-half-cent gasoline tax to the development of the interstate highways.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Would my friend then want us to be in the position of entering into a contract or an obligation with a State thinking that we were going to get approximately \$910 million of revenue, and then the other body deciding that we were only going to get approximately \$700 million? We would then be faced with the problem of canceling our obligations.

Mr. NELSON. No; the gentleman is objecting to the linkage of the tax in connection with the development of our highways. I think the development of our highways is the responsibility of the Federal Government, regardless of the income from the gasoline taxes.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I think it is the responsibility of the States and the Federal Government, but I also think it is our responsibility to be honest and fair with the road users and see to it that the money they are paying for gas tax goes on the roads.

Mr. NELSON. Does not the gentleman consider that this limitation on the expenditure of \$200 million is in effect an announcement that your committee does not consider that the Government has any responsibility for interstate highways unless and only as long as it collects the gasoline tax?

Mr. MCGREGOR. No; the gentleman is entirely wrong. I am certain that the gentleman has not read the hearings. We had weeks and weeks of hearings on this. Certainly, we tried to be fair and not infringe upon the Committee on Ways and Means, as the chairman so stated a few moments ago.

Mr. NELSON. I have no doubt about that at all.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman from Maine, in his colloquy with my colleague who is addressing us from the well of the House, has said numerous times that your committee has made appropriations for highway purposes. Now, to keep the record straight, is it not true that what your committee has done is to authorize this expenditure, but it has made no appropriations? I just would like to have the record straight on that.

Mr. MCGREGOR. That is correct. We cannot initiate an appropriation bill, we can only authorize. As you readily recall, the Committee on Appropriations took out \$55 million of our authorization bill for 1954.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I want to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman on the fine statement he is making, and to commend him also for the provision in the bill with respect to forest highways. I note the bill provides for an authorization of \$22½ million for forest highways. As the gentleman knows, we are extremely interested in that subject. I assume that we can count on the gentleman's support when that authorization bill or rather appropriation bill comes up.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Certainly, and I recognize the gentleman's interest in forest highways as well as in the rest of the highway program, he has discussed the problem with me many times.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I think the gentleman from Ohio has done a very fine job in presenting this bill. I congratulate him and I congratulate the members of his committee for the excellent work that they have done. However, I do have a few questions. If I understood the gentleman correctly, the bill which we are now considering does not change previous law going back to, let us say, 1948, 1947, or 1946 except that you have increased the amounts. But the allocation or the formula remains the same.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Yes, with the exception of the interstate system, which we put on a 60-40 basis.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yes. But, as I understood the gentleman, no money has ever been earmarked in the Federal Treasury for the use of the highways, and this bill does not earmark any money; is that not correct?

Mr. MCGREGOR. That is correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Then, under this bill a certain amount is authorized, which is larger than any other previous bill in history or in recent years, and once we pass this bill and that money is authorized, it will be the obligation of the Federal Government whether the Federal gas tax is reduced or not; is that not correct?

Mr. MCGREGOR. That is correct, except on the interstate system.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Therefore, there would be no direct relationship between this bill and the retaining of the present 2-cent per-gallon tax?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I do not think that is true.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. And that is the wording of this bill as of now, is it not?

Mr. MCGREGOR. That is correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. May I say one more word? Then, in the event that the Congress should see fit to reduce the Federal gasoline tax from 2 cents to 1½ cents a gallon sometime in the future, the next bill that comes from this committee would have to take that into consideration; but in no way would it affect the legislation now pending before us.

Mr. MCGREGOR. The question then would be for the Congress to decide upon the amount of money it would authorize.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. At some future date.

Mr. MCGREGOR. That is right.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It would be the obligation of the Congress to find the money for this purpose, even if it had to go into the Federal Treasury and take money out that had been acquired from the highway user under some other tax, such as the tax on tires or tubes, or new automobiles, or automobile parts; am I correct?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I think the language is very clear on that.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Referring to section 9, am I to infer from reading that section, that there is support in the committee for a policy of permitting the use of these Federal funds in the relocating and reconstruction of public utilities?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I think the gentleman is right in the assumption that there is support in the committee, because many members of the committee feel that there is a problem relating to utilities. Some of the members wanted to earmark 4 percent or 5 percent of the fund for that specific purpose, but we decided that a study should be made first to determine various States rights.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If I may ask one other question, at the present time none of these Federal funds may be used for such relocation or reconstruction or to assume any part of the cost of operating a public utility; is that right?

Mr. MCGREGOR. That is correct—except condemnation on private property.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I should like to call attention of the membership to the secondary-road problem. We have heard that the governors and various other State officials want more control. On page 3 you will find a clause which gives to the State highway departments the right to draw plans and specifications and construct secondary roads to meet the needs in a particular area. There we are doing away with the practice of having to adhere to rigid Federal specifications, which are more costly than the type of road in certain areas requires.

There was reference a few moments ago that upon recommendation, the States may take the initiative, and permit a transfer from one fund to the other, of 25 percent. That is made flexible so that if the States have more money in the primary fund than they need and are short in the urban fund, they can transfer from primary to urban; or vice versa, the exception being the interstate system.

I should like to say a word on the matter of the population basis. You have heard arguments here this afternoon to the effect that the formula for the interstate roads should be on a basis of population alone. You have heard arguments to the effect that it should be based on the old formula alone. We

had \$200 million. Along with other members of the committee I agreed that in order to be fair we should divide the \$200 million; take \$100 million, or 50 percent, to be spent on the basis of population, and the other \$100 million distributed according to the old formula, that is, one-third, one-third, and one-third.

That was the compromise, Mr. Chairman, and I hope that this Committee stays with that compromise. There are arguments that could be made on both sides.

I wish we had money enough to give every rural Representative all the money that he wanted and to give every urban Representative all the money that he wanted. But we do not have it. So this is a compromise, and I hope the Committee will go along with it.

This is not a perfect bill. There are some things in it that some of us do not like. But we have spent weeks and weeks on this proposed legislation, and I hope the Committee will join with every member of our committee in endeavoring to keep the bill intact, as it is written, and then send it over the other body for consideration.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WATTS].

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Chairman, in discussing H. R. 8127, the Federal Aid Road Act for the fiscal years of 1956 and 1957, I am sure that every member of the committee shares with me a feeling of gratification that we are authorizing the appropriation and spending of Federal money on projects to improve our own country. Good roads have contributed much to the expansion and growth of this country. They have added much to the health, happiness, and welfare of our people and have made possible to a large extent our economic expansion and the great wealth of material things that we all enjoy.

The great trouble has been and now is that we have not and are not even in this bill expending as much as we should and certainly not enough to have and enjoy a system of roads such as we all want and should have.

Money spent on the improvement, education, and welfare of our own people never seems to be enough to accomplish our objectives and our needs. Yet every dollar that we spend in these fields is returned to us and to future generations many times over. While H. R. 8127 authorizes more money to be spent on our Federal-aid roads than has ever been authorized before, and while being a step in the right direction, it by no means meets the need. It has been accurately estimated that as of November 1953, 63.8 percent of our roads on the Federal-aid system are now below safe standards for such roads and that expenditures of about thirty-five billions would have to be made to bring them up to the standard of safety that is needed. This same report or estimate shows that we are not even keeping even with our road-building program—that 2 years ago it would have required thirty-two billions to put our roads in good condition, whereas today it would take at least thirty-five billions. We are falling behind in spite of

the large sums we are spending on our highways.

H. R. 8127 authorizes the spending of \$800 million in each of the years of 1956 and 1957 on our primary, secondary, urban, and interstate systems of roads as against the sum of \$575 million for fiscal years 1954 and 1955.

While our committee recognized that this is not as much money as could be beneficially spent, the majority of the committee felt that under all the circumstances with which our country is faced today that it was about as much as we could afford to spend.

The committee held extensive hearings in the spring of 1953 on national highway problems and gained much information that has been a real help in framing this piece of legislation. We held adequate hearings immediately prior to the introduction of H. R. 8127 as a clean bill. In our hearings we quickly discovered that all categories of our roads needed more money. More money was needed on the primary system, on the secondary system, and on the urban system. This bill provides more money on all of those systems on a percentage division among the States. That is basic law and has worked very well for a number of years.

It was almost the unanimous opinion of all witnesses that appeared before us and the opinion of the committee that the greatest need was for a rapid development of the Federal system of interstate roads. This system of over 38,000 miles comprises the main arterial highways of our country. They were selected by the highway departments of the various States. They are the main defense roads of our country. They carry the bulk of our interstate traffic. While representing only about 1 percent of our roads, 20 percent of our travel and traffic is over them. These roads run through both the rural and urban sections of our country and are parts of our primary and urban systems. The committee authorized \$200 billion for this system for each of the years covered by this legislation. We further provided that on this system of roads, which in reality is a primary obligation of the Federal Government, that the Federal Government should provide 60 percent of the cost of construction and reconstruction of same and that the States should provide 40 percent, making allowances in addition to those States that have large public landholdings within their borders. By this change in matching formula I feel that these things will be accomplished; mainly, first, it will accelerate the building of this system of roads; second, it will allow the construction, particularly in large cities, of many costly improvements that have long been delayed due to their high construction cost; third, it will help many States who are or will be hard pressed to match Federal funds on road construction.

The committee adopted a new formula for the distribution of the interstate funds among the several States. Many members of the committee wanted the sum distributed on the old formula—one-third on population, one-third on area, one-third on miles of rural and star-route roads. Many others wanted

the funds provided solely on a population basis. Neither group got exactly what it wanted, but a large majority on the committee finally determined that the fair and proper thing to do was to distribute the funds on a divided basis—that is, one-half or \$100 million should be divided among the States on the old formula, and the remaining one-half, or \$100 million, should be divided on a population basis with the provision that out of the fund divided on a population basis no State should receive less than three-fourths of 1 percent of that fund. While this was not satisfactory to all members of the committee, I for one who come from a State that would be benefited by the entire sum being divided on the old formula feel that on the evidence before our committee and all other things considered that the action of the committee and the terms of the bill as it is before you was, and are, fair.

The committee made several other changes in the present highway law that were thought to be beneficial and needed in the legislation.

First. The bill provides that as to the funds for the primary, secondary, and urban systems that upon the request of the highway department of a respective State and with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce 25 percent of any of these funds could be transferred to any one or more of the other funds, but at the same time limiting the amount that any such fund could be increased to 25 percent.

Second. The bill further provides that this same arrangement shall apply to any funds heretofore authorized. This change in the law will be very beneficial in that it recognizes that different States have different problems, that in some States more money may be needed on a particular system, whereas in other States the reverse may be true. At least, it allows each State to evaluate its own problems and shift some of the funds so as to better meet those problems.

Third. A further change effected by the bill deals with the construction of secondary roads. Under present law the construction of secondary roads on the Federal-aid system are all required to fit or be up to more or less a rigid standard with little leeway for deviation therefrom. This legislation somewhat relaxes that rigid standard and provides that the highway departments of the different States may submit overall plans for design and construction of such roads subject to the approval of the Secretary of Commerce; and when such plans have been approved, the Secretary may discharge his responsibility as to individual projects in a State by receiving a certification from the highway department of that State that the plans for the project conform to the standards approved for that State. This change recognizes the need for different types and kinds of construction on secondary roads in the different States and recognizes differences in different parts of the same State. It vests more authority and latitude in the various highway departments in dealing with problems in their States.

With the exception of the changes above noted, H. R. 8127 generally conforms to former highway bills except

that a continuation of the 2-cent gas tax is made necessary by the language of the bill if the \$200 million provided for the interstate system is to be made available to the States and further provides for a study by the Secretary of Commerce in cooperation with the State highway departments and other interested parties of the problems posed by the relocation and reconstruction of public utilities services for highway improvement.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WATTS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I first want to compliment my distinguished colleague on the excellent statement he is now making. What are the requirements in connection with the secondary road system; I mean does the State road commissioner have more latitude under this authorization bill than in the previous bill?

Mr. WATTS. I may say to the gentleman that under existing law the Federal Bureau of Public Roads adopted pretty much a rigid standard and required that all States construct their secondary roads in accordance with that standard. We have attempted in this legislation to relax this standard so that now all the highway department has to do is go before the Bureau of Public Roads and present a standard that fits that State—that will work good in that State—and if the Bureau of Public Roads feels that standard is adequate it will approve the overall plans for that State. The Secretary of Commerce or the Bureau of Public Roads may then discharge its obligation so far as the secondary roads are concerned by receiving from the highway departments of the various States a certification that the plans and specifications on the individual projects conform to the overall plans and specifications that have been heretofore approved for that State by the Bureau of Public Roads.

Mr. PERKINS. Let us assume that we are back home in Kentucky for just a few moments. In the area that I represent in eastern Kentucky it is impractical in many instances to obtain a 60-foot right-of-way due to the narrowness of valleys.

Under the present law, as I understand, you cannot get matching funds from the Federal Government unless you obtain that 60-foot right-of-way. Now, let us assume that we have acquired a right-of-way up some narrow valley of only 30 feet. Would it be possible to receive matching funds for the 30-foot right-of-way for the purpose of constructing an 18-foot roadbed from the Federal Government?

Mr. WATTS. I cannot tell the gentleman that the Federal Bureau of Roads or the Department of Commerce would approve a plan along that line, but I will say that the language as written in this bill makes it possible for the approval of a road of that kind, whereas the old language did not.

(Mr. WATTS and Mr. DONDERO asked and were given permission to revise and extend their remarks.)

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, this proposal to amend the Federal Aid Road Act by revising the formula for the allocation of Federal funds and giving the States more responsibility for the proper expenditure of these funds is of primary importance to the country at this time.

The current economic conditions have reduced the amount of State funds available for matching purposes and at the same time caused widespread unemployment. This authorization for an appropriation approximately equal to the receipts from the Federal gasoline tax is fully justified as this tax comes from the same source as that of the major portion of the State highway funds. The practice of diverting a portion of the proceeds from the Federal gasoline tax to uses other than highway construction must be stopped. The increased construction costs make it more than necessary that every possible source of funds for the construction of an adequate national highway system be fully utilized.

Modern highways must be built to sustain the heavy traffic of interstate trucking with secondary roads adequate to carry this heavy traffic to every section of the country. This interstate traffic is one of the major items that has increased the cost of building a good State system of highways. This increased cost is definitely a proper charge against the Federal Government. It is impossible to make an exact breakdown of the cost to be charged to the Federal program, but this ratio of 60-40 is more reasonable in the light of current conditions than is the old ratio of 50-50. In fact, I would gladly go along with the ratio originally proposed in this bill of 3 to 1.

The liberalization, as I understand, of the requirements for secondary roads in particular is also a progressive step. The long history of Federal-State cooperation in highway building clearly indicates that the Federal Government need not be so strict as to sometimes appear unreasonable in order to assure that the State highway departments will make proper use of these funds. There will always be some need of Federal standards but that does not mean that the Federal highway engineers be required to follow in detail every action taken by the State highway departments.

The delegation of responsibility to the State highway departments, which are fully responsible to the people for their actions, will do much to expedite both the Federal and State highway programs. The current rise of unemployment makes it more urgent that our road-building program be expanded at the earliest possible date.

I know that all the Members in this body are concerned about our inadequate highway system. The lack of both water and highway transportation has retarded industrial development in the area that I represent in eastern Kentucky.

I deeply regret that the committee has seen fit to postpone the effective date of this authorization bill until July of 1955.

I am hopeful that more consideration will be given to our secondary-road system. In many rural areas school children are now forced to walk several miles to school, and at times, wade the creek.

I have always doubted the wisdom in denying matching funds to certain rural areas because local governments are not able to comply with rigid standards and specifications of the Federal Government. In many instances it is now impractical to meet the Federal requirement of a 60-foot right-of-way for the construction of rural roads due to the narrowness of the valleys.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to support this legislation.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY].

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, it is rather confusing to me to be told that we are going to spend all this money collected by way of gasoline tax. I am going to vote for a continuation of 2 cents Federal gasoline tax, but it is disturbing to me to know that as of April 1 of this year there is not one cent of money you are talking about appropriating today in this bill that any of the States will get before a year from next July. That is when it becomes effective. We are now spending for Federal-aid roads a total of \$575 million a year. We are collecting, or have collected last year, more than \$900 million, and the increase is at the rate of between 5 and 7 percent annually. So, from April 1954 to July 1955 there will be collected by the Federal Treasury approximately \$500 million more than will be used on the highway system. By the time that this \$800 million Federal aid will be used in fiscal years 1956-57 the take by the Federal Treasury from the taxpayers of this country will be running about \$1.1 billion a year at least.

I tried to get a bill through that would amend the Federal-aid highway law now in effect by adding \$200 million a year for the interstate roads. We are told by every speaker that they are defense roads, so selected by the Defense Department, the Bureau of Public Roads, and the highway departments of the respective States.

You would think by the allocation of some of these funds on a population basis that the amount of roads in the respective States had nothing to do with it. The 29 States that are going to take a beating on this bill on this population basis have 23,342 miles out of the 37,000 miles in this interstate system, and there are 13,616 miles in what is known as the area of population. That is the situation. I am getting rather tired of talking so much about this bill.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. I want to ask the gentleman two questions, and he has touched on both of them. Under the Federal excise tax of 2 cents a gallon, is all of that income from gasoline confined to highway construction or does the Federal

Government use any part of it for any other service?

Mr. DEMPSEY. The funds are commingled with the general fund and we get whatever the roads committee recommends and is approved by the House, when the bill is signed by the President. We are using about \$575 million out of more than \$900 million that was collected last year.

Mr. WIER. The gasoline tax is diverted to other expenditures?

Mr. DEMPSEY. It is and always has been, and it is going to be under this bill.

Mr. WIER. That is what I understand.

The next question I want to ask the gentleman from New Mexico is this: In the gentleman's first presentation under the rule he used the figure that the State of Minnesota would lose approximately \$800,000.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Seven hundred and eighty-nine thousand dollars a year.

Mr. WIER. I have heard this new formula used quite often here. Will the gentleman explain why it is that Minnesota loses \$800,000-odd as the result of this new formula?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Under the old formula, which was based on population, area, and miles of road, out of \$100 million the State of Minnesota received \$2,617,000. Under the population formula you will receive \$1,828,000. That is where you lose.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Under the existing law, the State of Minnesota gets \$13,744,000, and under the bill that is before us for consideration the State of Minnesota gets \$18,798,000.

Mr. DEMPSEY. May I say to the chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee that the gentleman did not ask me how much they would be entitled to with these additional funds, he asked what they were going to lose because of the change in formula.

Mr. WIER. If the gentleman will yield, that is a different picture. I was assuming that the State of Minnesota, under this new formula of population, would have been \$800,000 shorter than they would have been under the old formula or the present formula.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Is the gentleman referring to the present formula of one-third, one-third, and one-third?

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is the present formula.

Mr. WIER. Yes; I am referring to the difference between what we will get under the new formula and what we would get under the old formula.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I hope the gentleman will recognize and give consideration to what he is getting under the new bill regardless of the taxes and what he would be getting under the old law. It is approximately \$5 million.

Mr. WIER. I do recognize that the State of Minnesota will get considerably more.

Mr. DEMPSEY. So will every other State.

Mr. WIER. I think that is due to the fact that more money is being appropriated.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is right. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, under the old formula, we had four categories. We have the urban, the secondary, the primary, and the interstate systems. The primary system apportionment was on a three-way basis of population, area, and mileage. The interstate system was on that basis. The secondary system was on that basis, and is now, but the urban system was not. That was recognized as a population proposition, and is on a population basis. I pleaded with the committee, both with the chairman of the subcommittee and the chairman of the full committee, to put in any amount that they wanted for the urban system if the cities were hard hit and needed more money, and told them that I would support that. But here we have just put in a new system, a new category in 1952 that they have been trying to get in since 1944. It was never possible because of the fear of what would happen, and it has happened. Right now, in the other body, one of the Members has gone further than this, and in his bill he wants to put the secondary road system on a population basis predicated upon the number of cars licensed in the respective States. Have you ever heard of such a thing as that? Farm-to-market roads, if you please, put on the basis of the number of cars owned in the respective States. I am perfectly amazed that anybody from the State of Michigan would support such a theory or philosophy, because, after all, we look to the State of Michigan to give us or sell us more cars. We are getting the best cars in the world, and we certainly are using them as much as we can. But I am afraid that, notwithstanding Henry Ford and some of the other people who have put America on wheels, that with the unjust taxes we are now collecting and have been collecting we are going to take a lot of our people off wheels.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the gentleman explain why the Secretary of Commerce is given discretionary power over the distribution of the funds?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I am glad the gentleman asked that question because that, too, was discussed at very great length. I was happy to find that the respective highway departments in the States could have some say as to what they should put in the secondary roads. I think a standard should be set up so that proper roads will be constructed. But the language in this bill is improper. It says he may do such and such in connection with this responsibility. It does not say he will do so. He could tell the State of West Virginia, "You can go ahead." Then he could tell the State of Iowa, "No; you cannot go ahead." There is nothing in this bill which makes it mandatory upon the Secretary of Commerce to give each State the same treatment.

If he says "No," that is no, and you cannot do it; but if he says "Yes," then you can do it. I have never seen legislation of that kind brought up on the floor of this House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Unfortunately, I did not hear all of the gentleman's remarks. Does the gentleman say that this bill gives discretionary power to the Secretary of Commerce?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes; let me read that part of the bill to you.

Mr. GROSS. That road aid was to be apportioned on the basis of cars owned?

Mr. DEMPSEY. No, no; that is not stated in this bill. The question asked me by the gentleman from West Virginia had to do with the Secretary of Commerce permitting different States to have money on the secondary road system and giving some States more liberal treatment than others. In other words, they can provide what they want and he may approve it. But I want to read to you the language in this bill. It states:

The Secretary of Commerce may discharge his responsibility relative to the plans, design, inspection, and construction of such secondary road projects upon his receipt and approval of a certified statement by the State highway departments setting forth that the plans, design, and construction for such projects are in accord with the standards and procedures of the respective States applicable to projects in this category approved by him.

He may do it. I think it should have said that he shall do it. Then we would be somewhere.

I will tell the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] another thing. We have been talking about who is getting this money. I will tell the gentleman how much he is going to lose in his State. Eight hundred and thirty thousand dollars in what the State of Iowa is going to lose.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the able gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Could the gentleman give the figures on North Carolina?

Mr. DEMPSEY. North Carolina loses \$15,000 a year.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. Does California gain or lose under this formula?

Mr. DEMPSEY. California loses in number of tourists but it gains in dollars. The State of California gets approximately \$1,800,000 more; it may be more than that. But every State north of California or every State around California—Oregon, Washington, Utah, Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico, Idaho—gets less. I think California would prefer to have good roads coming into the State, because they represent the big source for tourists in America. That is, California is the largest area for tourists in

America. Florida comes next. Despite the great citrus fruit crop in California, the greatest dollar crop is the tourists who come to California. That is the great cash crop in California.

Mr. ENGLE. Will the gentleman yield further for a comment?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. The gentleman is eminently correct. We want good roads leading into California.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman is not going to get them on this basis.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. How does Arizona come out on this basis?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Not very well. Arizona loses \$1,544,000. I had a letter on this from your Representative in the other body.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I am sure the gentleman wants to get the figures right for the record. On the basis in the bill, California would get \$9,255,000, and on a basis of population it would get \$12,974,000.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I have the figures right here. California would gain about \$1,835,000 each year. But every State around California would lose. I think the State of California is more concerned about the roads leading into it, which would bring the tourists into California, because California itself has done a very good job with its roads, perhaps the best of any State in the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHERER. This is not a question of what a State loses under this formula, is it?

Mr. DEMPSEY. No; it is a question of what the national defense loses. These are national defense roads.

Mr. SCHERER. Is it not a fact that the figures that I quoted in my remarks on the rule are correct; namely, that the improvement in the 8 States will cost 51½ percent of the total and that if the money is divided as you say it should be, they will get only 32.4 percent, while the States—

Mr. DEMPSEY. I heard the gentleman's speech and did not interrupt him when he made it, notwithstanding I thought his philosophy was somewhat wrong. But that is the gentleman's opinion to which he has a right.

Mr. SCHERER. Will the gentleman permit me to finish my statement? Is it not a fact that all the State highway officials agree with my philosophy, including the officials of the gentleman's own State?

Mr. DEMPSEY. No; they did not. They voted against it.

Mr. SCHERER. In the gentleman's State?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes; and also in the State of Arizona. Both of those States voted against it.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

[Mr. EVINS addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR].

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I just want to correct the record. Our distinguished friend from New Mexico has left an erroneous impression, I am sure quite unintentionally, but just let us get down to the facts: California under the basic section 21 specifications that the gentleman from New Mexico is advocating, would get \$9,255,000; and under population would get \$12,974,000.

Texas under basic 21 would get \$13,030,000; and under population \$9,450,000.

Illinois under basic 21 would get \$7,763,000; and under population \$10,677,000.

Ohio under basic 21 would get \$7,026,000; and under population \$9,738,000, in round figures.

Michigan under basic 21 would get \$6,250,000; under population \$7,809,000.

Pennsylvania under basic No. 21, advocated by the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico, would get \$7,920,000; under population, \$12,866,000.

New York under the recommendation of the gentleman from New Mexico would get \$9,501,000; and under population, \$18,174,000.

New Jersey under basic No. 21 would get \$2,618,000; and on a population basis would get \$5,926,000.

I repeat that we attempted to make a compromise between the rural and the city areas.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The State of New Jersey which the gentleman just mentioned has 192 miles of the interstate system. The State of New York has 1,034 miles.

As I remember, the State of Pennsylvania has 1,300 miles.

The State of Texas has 2,700 miles not put on her by the State of Texas but put on her by the Defense Department for defense roads and you cut them down.

Mr. MCGREGOR. That was O. K.'d by the Highway Department of Texas.

Mr. DEMPSEY. But it was not O. K.'d by the people of Texas.

Mr. MCGREGOR. The highway department O. K.'d it.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That may be.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

(Mr. MACK of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, just before coming to the

floor of the House I obtained from the National Safety Council a report on the number of automobile accidents which occurred in the United States in calendar year 1953.

The National Safety Council places the number of automobile accidents for 1953 at 9,500,000. In these accidents, the National Safety Council says, there were 1,350,000 people injured and 33,300 killed. In addition to that the National Safety Council says that the property losses and the expenses incurred through medical and hospital services as a result of these accidents totalled \$3,950,000,000.

This great number of deaths according to Mr. James Cope, vice president of the Chrysler Corp., who testified before the Public Works Committee as a representative of the Automobile Manufacturers' Association, were to a great extent preventable. He stated that the Nation's best traffic authorities estimated that 2 in every 5 traffic deaths automatically would have been avoided if present highway deficiencies did not exist.

Thus, according to the Nation's best traffic experts, the lives of about 13,000 traffic victims would have been saved had the Nation, last year, possessed adequate highways. The main justification for proving the increased highways building sums which this bill would authorize is that the additional money will provide safer highways to save lives, to lessen the number of persons being injured, and to decrease the economic and financial losses which occur as the result of unnecessary accidents that result from the inadequacies of our present highways.

President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union message, urged that the present 2-cent-a-gallon Federal gasoline tax be kept in effect after April 1, 1954, when it is due to expire. In return for keeping the 2-cent a-gallon Federal tax in effect, the President promised an expanded highway program.

This bill provides for that expanded-highway program. It fulfills the President's promise.

President Eisenhower in his state of the Union speech in January said:

To protect the vital interest of every citizen in a safe and adequate highway system, the Federal Government is continuing its central role in the Federal-aid highway program. So that maximum progress can be made to overcome present inadequacies in the interstate highway system, we must continue the Federal gasoline tax at 2 cents per gallon. This will require cancellation of the one-half-cent decrease which otherwise will become effective April 1, and will maintain revenues so that an expanded highway program can be undertaken.

During the past 2 years, the Federal Government, under existing legislation, provided the States with \$575 million a year in Federal matching funds. This bill increases the amount of these matching funds to \$800 million, or in short, increases them by \$225 million.

In addition to this \$800 million there is \$75 million in this bill for other types of highways, forest highways, parkways, and so forth. The total amount of money in this bill for highways is \$875 million.

During the past year, the Federal Government collected \$906 million from its 2-cent-a-gallon tax on liquid fuels, gasoline and diesel oil. The new bill, therefore, gives back to the States for highway purposes nearly all of the money derived from the Federal 2-cent gasoline tax. This, in my opinion, is sound policy. Federal gasoline taxes should not be diverted to other purposes than road building.

Gasoline taxes are paid by a special class of our citizens—the American motorists. These taxes are paid by the motorist largely in proportion to the number of miles he drives and therefore, in essence are based on the extent to which a motorist uses the highways. What the motorist pays in gasoline taxes should be used by both the Federal Government and the States to building more, better, and safer highways.

These gasoline-tax revenues should not be diverted to foreign aid or to any other purposes.

MUST PAY FOR ROADS

All of the evidence submitted before our Public Works Committee, which sponsors this bill, indicated that American highways are wearing out much faster than old ones have been repaired or replaced or new ones built. This evidence was to the effect that \$35 billion will be required to place our American highways in A-1 condition.

Whether money is spent to build these needed highways or not taxpayers will pay for them just the same.

If the highways the Nation desperately needs are built, the motorists must pay for them in taxes. If the highways are not built the motorist will pay for them just the same in increased wear and tear on his car and tires, in costlier repair bills, in higher medical and hospital expenses and in higher automobile insurance rates.

In the long run the motorists will be better off paying a 2-cent gasoline tax provided that the revenue derived from this tax is expended on more, better and safer highways.

In the long run it is cheaper to build good highways now than not to build them.

INCREASE IN CARS

In the past 20 years, the number of motor vehicles, automobiles, buses and trucks, using our American highways have more than doubled.

In 1931, there were only 25.8 million motor vehicles licensed in this country. By 1952, this number had doubled and stood at 53.3 million.

Between 1931 and 1952, the number of motor trucks licensed and using American highways increased fivefold, from 42,000 to 240,000.

The number of motor trucks using our highways in 1931 was 3.5 million. In 1952 there were 9.2 million, nearly 3 times as many as in 1931.

The number of pleasure automobiles licensed in the United States increased from 22.3 million in 1931 to 43.8 million in 1952.

The number of motor vehicles using the highways is still increasing and will continue to increase.

The population of the Nation which in 1900 was less than 75 million by 1950 had doubled and stood at more than 150 million. There is every reason to believe that, barring a war of extermination, that our Nation's population will double again in the last half of the century and stand at about 300 million by 2000 A. D.

If the population doubles, the number of motor vehicles in use, it may be expected, also will double. The Nation, probably, will have 100 million instead of the present 53 million motor vehicles on its highways within 50 years. Our highway problem is not finished. It is just beginning.

In building more, better, and safer highways we build not alone for the present but also for the future.

HOW PACIFIC COAST FARES

My constituents will be interested in knowing how the three Pacific Coast States of Oregon, Washington, and California will benefit from this bill.

I have obtained from Commissioner F. V. du Pont, of the Federal Bureau of Roads, how much each of these three States will share in the increased funds in this bill.

Washington during each of the past 2 years has received \$9,148,000 a year in Federal highway matching funds. Under this bill, Washington State will be allocated, Commissioner du Pont informs me, \$12,805,000 a year for each of the next 2 years. This will be an increase of \$3,657,000 a year for Washington State for each of the next 2 years.

Oregon during the past 2 years has received \$8,502,000 a year in Federal highway matching funds. Under this bill, Oregon will be allocated \$11,685,000 a year for each of the next 2 years. This will be an increase for Oregon of \$3,183,000 a year over the amount now being received.

California during the past 2 years has been receiving \$29,912,000 a year in Federal highway matching funds. Under this bill, California will be allocated \$43,061,000 a year during each of the next 2 years. This will be an increase of \$13,049,000 a year for California.

Altogether, the 3 Pacific coast States will receive about \$20 million a year or \$40 million during the next 2 years more than these 3 States received in Federal matching funds during the past 2 years.

Under this bill, most of this Federal money must be matched on a 50-50 basis by the States. This means that during the next 2 years there will be \$80 million more spent on the highways of these 3 States than in the past 2 years. This additional \$80 million, on top of the millions already being expended, will do wonders toward improving the highways of the Pacific coast by making them wider, better, and safer.

TO HELP MANY INDUSTRIES

The bill carries a total of \$300 million more in Federal matching funds for the 48 States and Territories than any previous highway bill.

Most of these Federal funds must be matched by the States on a 50-50 basis. This means that the additional \$300 million of Federal money will stimulate a

\$600 million increase in the Nation's highway building program during each of the next 2 years—will increase that highway building program by more than a billion dollars during the next 2 years.

Such an increase in the highway building program means the creation of jobs for tens of thousands of additional construction workers.

Also, this vast expansion of the national highway program means the creation of an enormous increased demand for cement, asphalt, steel, lumber, plywood, and all of those other materials that go into highway and bridge construction. This will bring into being tens of thousands of additional jobs for those who work to produce building and construction materials.

The railroads, truck and other transportation companies, also, will benefit through the increased freight this expanded road program will generate.

While the bill is not perfect in every detail, it is the best highway bill ever presented to Congress. I am proud to have, as a member of the House Public Works Committee, participated in writing it. I hope it will have the support of all Members of the House.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today is on the whole a very good highway bill, one that has the bipartisan endorsement of the Committee on Public Works, one that will go a long ways toward meeting the highway problems that we have in this country of ours. The main complaint I have against the bill is that the sum authorized is still entirely inadequate to meet the highway needs of the Nation on a year-to-year basis. I do not believe that we should ever allow ourselves to get into a position in regard to Federal appropriations for highways of saying: We will only appropriate so much money as we get in the way of a Federal gasoline tax.

With respect to that idea, it is well to call the attention of the Members of the House who have listened to the debate as to how distribution of the interstate highway system money will be applied, because we have had a serious effort made in the past few years to do away entirely with the Federal gasoline tax and to do away entirely with the Federal system of highway aid. I would like to call the attention of those of us who represent some of the so-called poor States that if that system is done away with we will be left out in the cold entirely. I think the compromise that has been worked out in regard to the interstate system in this bill is reasonable and equitable.

I call your attention to the fact that the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR] comes from a State that would benefit greatly if the interstate funds were allocated purely on the basis of population. I happen to come from a State that would benefit if the allocation was purely on the basis of the old formula. I believe, however, that in the compromise that has been worked out, where

equal attention is given to both of these factors, we have reached a solution that is best for all of us concerned. If those of us from the so-called poorer States, from the large and sparsely settled States, succeeded in writing into the law a provision that ignores the needs of the highly populated States, we are liable to wake up 2 years from now and find that we get no Federal highway aid.

As has been pointed out on the floor here before, the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations is studying this problem now. Under the former Chairman of that Commission, I think it is very likely that we would have come through with a recommendation to do away with the Federal aid to highways system. I hope the Commission will not come through with that recommendation. If it does not, the reason will be in good part due to the fine work done by the Subcommittee on Highways of our committee under the leadership of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR]. A very thorough study of this entire problem was made at great length last year, with hearings that took more than 13 weeks. It was the considered opinion of most of those who testified at that time that the Federal-aid system should be continued.

I fully realize the problems of these urban areas; that these highly populated areas must be fully considered and some attempt be made to resolve these problems in this legislation as is proposed in the portion of the bill that gives distribution of these funds in half on the interstate system on the basis of population. I think it is a fair and reasonable proposition as presented to us today, and I hope that the House will go along with this attempt that the committee has made to arrive at a meeting of the minds in the committee that will, so far as is possible for to do so, meet the needs of the entire country. We are not legislating here today to solve the highway problem of Mississippi, Ohio, or any other individual State. We are attempting to help and work out a national highway system that will, insofar as possible, meet the basic needs of this country.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER].

(Mr. SCUDDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, the bill you have before you today is the work of several months of investigation by the subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works. I believe they have given to you a comprehensive, well-rounded piece of legislation for your consideration.

There are a few matters that have not been touched upon during the course of the discussion, and I would like to give you a few figures that seem rather important to me. While this bill is not one of linkage, nor do we by this bill endeavor to appropriate all moneys that are collected in the form of gas tax, there is a relationship, because most of us feel that the ordinary motorist, when he drives up to a gas station to purchase

gasoline, does that with a feeling that the tax that he is paying is being used for the construction and maintenance of highways throughout our entire country.

In 1952 there was collected in gas tax \$866,221,000. The highway users contributed \$800,755,000. The nonusers of the highways paid in gas tax that year \$65,466,000. We had complaints come to us from the airplane companies that they were paying a gas tax and, therefore, their portion of the tax should not be used for highways. The same type of complaint came from farmers, who said that the gas tax on tractors and other implements used on the farm should not be used for highways. We also had similar complaints from the motorboat owners.

I made some research and I found that this coming year we expect to collect about \$910 million. It is estimated that 91 percent of the tax will be paid by the highway users, in other words \$878,100,000 of the money to be paid in through this tax will be paid by the highway users. The amount set forth in this bill is quite a coincidence in that we are asking in the bill for \$875 million, so there is a spread of only a little over \$3 million in favor of the general fund left from the taxes paid by the users of the highways. It seems to me that should satisfy everyone when it comes to an equal distribution of the taxes paid.

I feel that another very important factor in this bill is that we have turned over to the various States the responsibility of constructing, maintaining, and writing the specifications for secondary roads. It was pointed out that the administrative cost of the Federal Bureau of Roads would be reduced by 50 percent if the secondary roads were handled entirely and directly by the State departments of highways. I think that is a very good argument in favor of this bill.

Another thing that you from the rural areas will be interested in is that this bill provides that the Federal Government may use urban money for the construction of secondary highways through the small municipalities. You are aware that the urban moneys go only to cities of 5,000 and more, so the smaller cities are left without any funds to assist them in building the trunklines through their small municipalities. This bill will assist them. The Highway Commission may appropriate urban moneys for the construction of highways through the small cities.

I feel that this is a very fine, well worked out bill, and urge your support of it in toto.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

(Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, we face two national crises—rising unemployment, which, if not checked, will bring us into a major depression; and a woefully inadequate highway system.

I maintain these two crises in the same breath, because a solution for one is a solution for both. Members of this body who drive to and from Washington, no

matter in what direction they leave the Capital, must be painfully aware of the poor condition of our highways.

The one good stretch of highway—the 18 miles of the Shirley Highway in Virginia—is rapidly becoming a death trap. Scarcely a week goes by that we do not pick up our morning newspaper and read of a serious accident.

When I drive to my home in East St. Louis, I travel over roads that are battered from the pounding of traffic. For long stretches they are narrow, and I am forced to crawl behind trucks or risk my life trying to pass. Quaint little Frederick bogs me down with congested streets; Cumberland slows me with interminable stop signs; Wheeling brings me almost to a crawl with steep hills, sharp turns, and a bridge more than 100 years old; the route takes me through the heavily congested areas of Columbus and Indianapolis.

My route takes me over an important artery, an artery over which flows the lifeblood of our economy; a route over which important military traffic must pass in time of war or national emergency. To me, the delays and the bumps mean only an inconvenience, and a month off the life of my car. As I experience these delays, however, I ask myself what they mean to the logistic snowball of military support. How many hours or days delay in a vital air strike results from 5 minutes loss by a truckload of electronic gear in Cumberland or Wheeling or Columbus?

Mr. Chairman, we in the Congress can take a long step toward solving the highway crisis. We may do it without deficit financing. All we need do is to recognize that an adequate interstate highway system is a Federal responsibility. Within a period of no more than 10 years we can build our interstate highway system up to par. We can do it without going into debt. The financing of such a program can be achieved by devoting all the money collected from gasoline and other taxes on highway users to the highway program.

That would provide about a billion and a half dollars a year to be spent on the highway system. States could continue to do the actual work, under Bureau of Public Roads supervision. But the States would not be required to match the funds. This would free state and ordinary Federal-aid funds for work on our rural highways and on streets over which interstate traffic rarely passes.

Now how would this meet the unemployment crisis? In the first place, it would provide jobs. The program would not be boondoggling, for we would be building to increase the national wealth and to increase the national security.

In the second place, unless our highways are made adequate the market for new automobiles will continue to shrink. More and more people will come to realize that it is folly to endanger a two thousand or more dollar investment on narrow, winding, rough highways. When fewer cars and trucks are built, less steel is consumed. When less steel is consumed, less coal is burned. That is something very close to me and the people living in the district I have the honor to represent.

Finally, I cannot stress too much the importance of adequate highways to our national defense. The Eisenhower administration is wedded to the military strategy of fast and massive retaliation. The effectiveness of such a strategy depends upon speed all along the line, not just in a fast carrier or a jet bomber. In a time of mobilization, every truck on our highways will be making a contribution to power we exert on the enemy. All the money we appropriate for jet aircraft, fast ships, and speedy tanks will be of no avail if these weapons are shackled by a horse and buggy highway system.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE].

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, service on a committee of this House is more like service on a jury than anything I know. Those of you who have served on juries know that you will sit day after day and hear testimony and then hear the court give the instructions on the law, and, then you will go out and all 12 of you will have a different idea as to what the verdict ought to be. Then you have to give and take. You do not surrender your convictions if it comes to that. You hang the jury.

There are 29 of us on this Committee on Public Works, and I presume that if we had had our way there would have been 29 different bills. I happen to represent a State that is rather thinly populated, and we are not entirely satisfied with the provisions of this bill. I think the division of the fund on the interstate highway system under this bill would get more votes and would be more equitable to the thinly populated and poorer States if the formula was 75/25. There are other features of the bill which I would change. I am not particularly strong for the idea of linkage because if we have the highway system, say, linked to the gasoline tax, and then a future Congress does away with the gasoline tax, we would be thrown into utter confusion with reference to our program. The interstate system is set up on a formula different from the general road funds which obtained through the years since I have been here and before. I have had quite a few phone calls, and some telegrams, and some letters expressing concern over the fact that this bill takes away or disturbs the old formula of the primary, secondary, and urban roads. I think that comes about by reason of the fact that here for the second time we have the interstate or so-called defense roads system mentioned. Indirectly, this defense roads system or the interstate system will help us because it will take from the primary system, for instance, in the State of Arkansas, although I do not remember the mileage, but Highway No. 70 goes through our State, and Highway No. 67 from Little Rock and northeast through our State—as I say, I do not recall the mileage but whatever the mileage is, it is subtracted from the primary system which has heretofore declared in our State, and we will have that much more to put on the primary, secondary system, and the urban system. Another thing that disturbs me too is the formula.

That is not new in this bill. It has been in other bills. We are losing population in the State of Arkansas, and it is largely because our road systems, our secondary or farm-to-market or rural routes and postal route roads are poor and people are just not going to live on those gravel roads when they can move to better roads. Then there is the so-called transfer in this bill as in the previous bill. We have a switch of 25 percent allowed. The highway department of the State of Arkansas, for instance, can take 25 percent of the funds allocated for secondary roads and use it on primary roads. But, by the same token, it can take 25 percent from the primary roads and use it on the secondary roads. The pressure gets pretty heavy on the highway department of the State. Personally, I would like to have that nailed down especially with reference to the secondary road system. Because if we can get those roads, and if they can be traveled over and get these people out of the mud, then our gas tax receipts will increase because the people will travel more. I can cite one instance in the district that I represent where the average travel on the highway was 75 vehicles per day, but it was paved and then the travel on that highway increased to about 300 vehicles per day. Of course, with the incidental increase in the gasoline tax money that was used.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the gentleman explain just how the State road department in my State or your State would take those funds that we are allocating for primary roads and use them on urban roads? Would the gentleman be a little more definite as to just how that could happen?

Mr. TRIMBLE. The highway department of the State, as I understand this legislation—and this was in legislation prior to this, and is not new in this particular bill—could, let us say, in the State of West Virginia have \$3 million for a primary system, and then, if the highway department decides they need more funds on the secondary system, they could take 25 percent, or \$750,000, and set it over on the secondary system, or vice versa.

Mr. BAILEY. They could also take funds for secondary roads and use them for access roads to municipalities in the urban centers?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I am not sure about that. I would not want to be bound by a statement to that effect. I think they can shift 25 percent of any of these funds to any other fund. That is my understanding of the bill.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GEORGE].

(Mr. GEORGE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I have been a member of this subcommittee that has been making a study of this road problem the past 2 years. I want to commend the membership of this committee. As you listened to the debate today, you noticed some difference

of opinion. Different areas are affected in different ways by this bill. It is a compromise bill between the various groups from the different types of States that we have in the United States, with the overall idea in mind that we are trying to pass legislation here which will do the greatest good to the greatest number of people.

Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to support H. R. 8127, because in my judgment, it is the most realistic highway construction bill ever considered by Congress. This bill was prepared after exhaustive hearings held many days last year in the 1st session of the 83d Congress, in which witnesses from all segments of our economy were heard. In addition, extensive hearings have been held this year before our Subcommittee on Roads, and the House Public Works Committee took final action on this bill after complete discussion.

There are many things in this bill that can be considered of a controversial nature. Each segment, however, of our people who are interested in highway construction, have something in this bill that commends itself to them. This bill raises the regular funds for highway construction \$100 million. In addition to that, \$200 million was established in comparatively new funds to be used on our strategic military network.

Altogether, this bill provides for additional construction of highways in our country amounting to over \$1 billion for the 2-year period fiscal 1956 and 1957. This is only a step in the right direction. It will not nearly meet the Nation's highway needs. I hope this expanded program will meet with such success that the people of the various States will ask Congress to increase the amount to be used on highway construction many millions of dollars per year in the near future.

We have been spending billions of dollars for foreign aid, and other billions for our military strength. It seems to me it is time that we are starting to partly meet our highway construction problems in the United States. This bill is a forward step in that direction.

Federal apportionment of funds State of Kansas would receive under new national Federal-aid-to-highways bill:

Primary.....	\$6,552,000
Secondary.....	4,587,000
Urban.....	1,390,000

Subtotal.....	12,529,000
---------------	------------

Interstate population formula.....	1,168,000
Old formula under sec. 21.....	2,446,000

Subtotal.....	3,614,000
---------------	-----------

Overall approximate total.....	16,143,000
1955 total.....	12,035,698

Increase per year.....	4,107,302
------------------------	-----------

Federal apportionment which Kansas is receiving under the 1952 law for fiscal 1954 and fiscal 1955:

	1954
Primary.....	\$5,950,738
Secondary.....	4,165,742
Urban.....	1,261,297
Interstate.....	605,853

Total.....	11,983,630
------------	------------

	1955
Primary-----	\$5,975,744
Secondary-----	4,183,753
Urban-----	1,267,798
Interstate-----	608,403
Total-----	12,035,693

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I should like to ask the gentleman a question; I should like to say beforehand, parenthetically, that I would not be so emboldened as to put my own individual judgment up against the judgment of the committee which has given so much thought and attention to this problem; not only to this one bill but to this problem over a period of years.

I want also to say that I have been in touch with the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR], who has always been attentive and interested and thoughtful and very nice about listening to suggestions. My concern with these public-works road bills now is that we have a tendency, in my judgment, to lose sight of the primary need for defense highways; and I get that idea from traveling through the country.

If we were to have world war III now I tremble to think about how we would move the traffic engendered by such a war over our highways, because they go through these urban centers, which are the first ones which would be knocked out, and they go through every town and village, and make no appreciable effort to bypass them. How to get military traffic through at a high rate of speed is the great question, and that is the thing that I see in the tendency, not of the committee so much, but the tendency of the citizens, the people, to overlook the need for defense highways.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct my remarks to section 2 (a), on page 5, this controversial proviso beginning in line 10. Despite what the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR] says of this bill and has to say about there being no connection or no linkage there, a lot of people back in my State seem to think that there is.

I have before me here—and I would like to include in the RECORD—a statement by the public-relations officer of the Standard Oil Co. located in my State protesting it.

I have another from one of the officers of the State Contractors' Association protesting it.

I am wondering if the gentleman will again explain to the members of the Committee why there is not a connection there. They seem to think so and my mind is not clear that there is not. So I ask the gentleman to explain it.

Mr. MCGREGOR. We simply say to the people that we cannot give you additional miles of better roads unless we have the money with which to do it. Now if we are talking about continuing the half-cent gas tax, that bill will be in here on Wednesday and everyone will

have an opportunity to vote "yes" or "no" on the continuation of the gas tax. This can be changed overnight; there is nothing permanent about this legislation whatsoever.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. J. M. Douds says:

We are definitely opposed to the provision linking the gasoline tax and the Federal-aid highway program because of the traditional responsibility of the Federal Government to construct and maintain interstate post and military roads.

It has been the tradition of the Government to do that. Why use the gasoline tax to do it? That is the question all will ask.

Mr. MCGREGOR. If you ask the average man on the street what the gasoline tax was used for he would say it was used for highways.

Mr. BAILEY. Under the circumstances I shall support the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa.

(Mr. EVINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, the pending measure to amend the Federal Aid Road Act and to authorize increased appropriations for the construction of highways is an important measure and certainly represents a forward-looking and progressive piece of legislation.

The building of better highways and improved secondary road systems for the Nation is a nonpartisan issue. We all are for, or should be for, better roads and improved highways. The new bill represents an extension of the Federal Aid Highways Act of years past and provides for carrying forward the basic highway pattern of Federal Government and State cooperation on a matching funds basis—a 50-50 basis with some exceptions.

The bill would authorize the appropriation of \$600 million for each of the fiscal years of 1956 and 1957 and to be made available to the States and expended as follows:

Two hundred and seventy millions of dollars for projects on Federal aid primary highway systems.

One hundred and eighty millions of dollars for Federal-aid projects on secondary road systems.

One hundred and fifty millions of dollars for projects on Federal-aid highway systems in urban areas.

Under this authorization, the State of Tennessee will receive \$5,851,000 in Federal aid funds for primary road construction; \$4,560,000 for Federal aid for secondary road construction; and \$2,139,000 for Federal aid for urban road construction—a total of \$12,550,000 in Federal aid for highway and rural road construction and development in the State of Tennessee—and a total of \$16,756,000 with the additional population increase basis.

This represents a substantial increase over funds provided in recent years and marks a progressive step forward. It is an indication of the fact that an increased highway construction program is needed and should be stimulated inasmuch as there has been a period of some laxity in road construction during the war years and postwar years.

Mr. Chairman, I have been somewhat concerned about the provisions contained

in the bill with respect to the transfer of funds from rural to urban road purposes and vice versa. The bill would permit not exceeding 25 percent of the amount authorized to be appropriated to the States, in any one year, to be transferred from the apportionment under one system to either of the others.

Many of us are greatly concerned about the construction of rural roads and it is to be hoped there will not be any substantial diversion or transfer of funds herein appropriated for rural road development to urban projects. It is noted that such transfer of funds can only be effected when requested and certified to by State highway departments of the various States and being in the public interest, and when approved by the Secretary of Commerce.

The apportionment is the same as before—on a 50-50 basis except in the case of the authorization of \$200 million for interstate highway construction in which case a new formula is adopted with the Federal Government making a contribution of 60 percent as compared with 40 percent from the States. This is to stimulate an increased interstate highway construction program.

This is a progressive measure, a constructive measure and represents an extension of progressive legislation which has been in effect for a number of years.

I wish to commend members of the committee for recommending this legislation and I urge its adoption.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEAL], a member of the committee.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chairman, insofar as linkage is concerned, it does not seem to me it makes a great deal of difference how you look at this matter. In West Virginia we have a gasoline tax which goes entirely to the support and maintenance of the highway system. We may be in this particular bill adopting the principle of linkage, yet it is temporary and it does not necessarily mean that it is a precedent.

I do not believe, after getting extensive information in the hearings extending over many weeks, that we could possibly present to you a bill that would satisfy everybody; however, there is something about this bill which I think needs to be commended and that is this: In all these years that we have been neglecting our highways, we have been building more and more automobiles and creating more and more traffic. We have diverted funds which we really should have used for highway purposes. We have diverted those funds to other purposes.

Regardless of the criticism you may have of this particular bill, it does one thing, it at least makes a start toward the Federal Government's assumption of its duty to improve the Federal highways. If the money comes from the gasoline tax, if it comes from the general fund or from whatever source, we must recognize it is a start in the right direction and certainly there is not anything in this country that needs the support of Federal funds as much as the highway system of the Nation. I think this is a good bill.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. As author of the pending bill, I want to pay my respects to the splendid work that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEAL] has done in behalf of good legislation. He has made many excellent contributions to problems studied by our committee.

Mr. NEAL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time on this side to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to point out that I believe this committee has taken the wrong approach when it attempts to change the formula whereby you take the money authorized in this legislation and change it to the formula as set forth on page 4 of this bill. I say that for the reason that all of us know that heretofore the formula used has been satisfactory and also, may I say, that this authorization where it changes that formula will be a disadvantage to the thing that you desire to accomplish. The thing that you desire to accomplish, as I understand it, is national defense highways.

In my State as an example, there has only been authorized 661 miles of roads for national defense highways, but under this apportionment we stand to lose over a million dollars. I know it has been said around here that if you would take a look at the figures compiled on page 20 of the report it will be found that the State of Colorado pursuant to old apportionment received \$8,484,000, and that on page 18 in pursuance to the appointment as set forth therein the State of Colorado would get \$11,958,000, an increase of approximately \$4 million. The thing that they have overlooked is that as they compiled the figures set forth on page 20 of the report they only used \$575 million as the appropriation.

In this bill we have \$800 million, and as the result, if we had had the same proportion—and it will apply to 29 other States—then we would have received in excess of almost \$13 million. Now, I can readily understand how many members of the Highway Engineers, meeting in a convention, were told that if you would follow this formula, then you would get \$3 or \$4 million for your respective States, but the thing that they did not tell them was that of the increased amount, and if they had followed the old formula, they would have received all the way from \$1 million to \$2 to \$5 million more under the old formula.

Mr. Chairman, it is therefore going to be my privilege when this bill is presented under the 5-minute rule to offer an amendment to strike that portion of the bill which deals with population only. I want to point out that if you are going to have this for a national-defense highway system, it is as essential to have that defense highway through sparsely settled sections of the United States as it is to have it in the thickly populated sections of the United States.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Under the formula on the interstate system of 60-40, the State of Colorado will get 65.16 percent of the Federal appropriation; in other words, you are getting 5.16 percent more than the average State will receive.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes, that is correct. This increase to Colorado is due to the fact the public lands formula has been employed. I have always supported the public land in the Highway Act, which the gentleman from Alabama well knows.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee or the author of the bill a question in regard to this interstate highway fund. In California we have one road that has given us a great deal of grief. It is Highway U. S. 40 which runs from San Francisco through Sacramento, over the Sierra Nevada Mountains at the Donner Pass and into Reno. It is an interstate highway. During the wintertime it is plugged up with snow and a great deal of the time is impassable. In the last session of the legislature the State legislature voted \$20 million to improve that highway, provided that the Federal Government would put up an additional \$20 million as a matching fund. Five of us Members of the House have introduced bills to authorize that particular contribution by the Federal Government, which would be additional and extra to the annual Federal aid allotment. Those measures are pending before your committee at this time, and we are seeking the support of the Defense Department for those bills, because this is a defense highway which, when blocked, cuts off the defense establishments east of the Sierra Nevada Mountains.

The question I want to ask the gentleman is this: Since \$200 million has been put into this bill, would it be possible to take California's portion of that \$200 million and use it in connection with the \$20 million now set aside and earmarked by the State of California for the improvement of Highway 40?

Mr. McGREGOR. It would be, if it were so recommended by the California State Highway Department and concurred in by the Bureau of Public Roads. They could probably take that amount before it is allocated anywhere else, because it would probably have preferential treatment because of its military value.

Mr. ENGLE. The State of California has already indicated the preferential treatment it wants to give this highway. As I understand, if the State of California, its road official, can convince the Bureau of Public Roads that this allocation which goes to California out of that \$200 million should be used on Highway 40, it can be used for that purpose.

Mr. McGREGOR. If they can prove it to the Public Roads Administration, it can be taken as part of the California

share under this new legislation; we are stressing the \$200 million interstate because of military value.

Mr. ENGLE. And because that is a primary defense highway?

Mr. McGREGOR. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ENGLE. I thank the gentleman, and I compliment the committee on the excellent work it has done on this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), and all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$600,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be available for expenditure as follows:

(a) \$270,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system.

(b) \$180,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system.

(c) \$150,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system in urban areas, and for projects on approved extensions of the Federal-aid secondary system within urban areas.

The sums authorized by this section for each fiscal year, respectively, shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with the formulas set forth in section 4 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838).

Any sums apportioned to any State under the provision of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for 2 years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized, and any amount so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse: *Provided*, That such funds for any fiscal year shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums apportioned to the State for such fiscal year is covered by formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the improvement of specific projects as provided by this act: *Provided further*, That in the case of those sums apportioned to any State for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system, the Secretary of Commerce may discharge his responsibility relative to the plans, design, inspection, and construction of such secondary road projects upon his receipt and approval of a certified statement by the State highway department setting forth that the plans, design, and construction for such projects are in accord with the standards and procedures of the respective States applicable to projects in this category approved by him: *Provided further*, That not more than 25 percent of the amount apportioned to each State under subparagraphs (a), (b), or (c) of this section may be transferred from the apportionment under one subparagraph to the apportionment under either of the other subparagraphs: *Provided further*, That such transfer is requested by the State highway department and is approved by the Secretary of Commerce as being in the public interest: *Provided further*, That the total of such transfers shall not increase the original apportionment under any subparagraph by more than 25 percent: *Provided further*, That the transfers hereinabove permitted for funds authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1956, and June 30, 1957, shall likewise be permitted on the same basis for funds heretofore or hereafter authorized to be appropriated for any prior or subsequent fiscal year: *And provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall

be deemed to alter or impair the authority contained in the last proviso to subparagraph (b) of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, and improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the national system of interstate highways, including extensions thereof through urban areas, designated in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of \$200 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like additional sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957. The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be apportioned among the several States in the following manner: one-half in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, as shown by the latest available Federal census: *Provided*, That no State shall receive less than three-fourths of 1 percent of the money so apportioned; and one-half in the manner now provided by law for apportionment of funds for the Federal-aid primary system: *Provided further*, That the Federal share payable on account of any project on the national system of interstate highways provided for by funds made available under the provisions of this section shall be increased to 60 percent of the total cost thereof, plus a percentage of the remaining 40 percent of such cost in any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 percent of the total area of all lands therein, equal to the percentage that the area of such lands in such State is of its total area: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Commerce shall not apportion to the States the sum authorized by this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, unless a Federal excise tax on gasoline in the amount of not less than 2 cents per gallon is in effect on September 30, 1954; and the Secretary of Commerce shall not apportion to the States the sum authorized by this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, unless a Federal excise tax on gasoline in the amount of not less than 2 cents per gallon is in effect on September 30, 1955.

(b) Any sums apportioned to any State under the provisions of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for 2 years after the close of fiscal year for which such sums are authorized: *Provided*, That such funds shall be deemed to be expended upon execution of formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the improvement of specific projects under this section.

(c) Any amount apportioned to the States under the provisions of this section unexpended at the end of the period during which it is available for expenditure under the terms of subsection (b) of this section shall lapse.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218), as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of \$22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957: *Provided*, That the authorization in section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 for forest highways for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, is hereby canceled; and (2) for forest development roads and trails the sum of \$22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957: *Provided*, That with respect to any proposed construction or reconstruction of a timber access road, advisory public hearings shall be held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area of construction or reconstruction with notice and reasonable opportunity for interested persons to present their views as to the practicability and feasibility

of such construction or reconstruction: *Provided further*, That hereafter funds available for forest development roads and trails shall also be available for vehicular parking areas: *Provided further*, That the appropriation herein authorized for forest highways shall be apportioned by the Secretary of Commerce for expenditure in the several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico in accordance with the provision of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950.

SEC. 4. (a) For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas administered by the National Park Service, including areas authorized to be established as national parks and monuments, and national park and monument approach roads authorized by the act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat. 1053), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

(b) For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of parkways, authorized by acts of Congress, on lands to which title is vested in the United States, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

(c) For the construction, improvement, and maintenance of Indian reservation roads and bridges and roads and bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian lands under the provisions of the act approved May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957: *Provided*, That the location, type, and design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be approved by the Secretary of Commerce before any expenditures are made thereon, and all such construction shall be under the general supervision of the Secretary of Commerce.

SEC. 5. Any unappropriated balance of the sums heretofore authorized to be appropriated by sections 5 and 6 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 158), for the Rama Road in Nicaragua and the Inter-American Highway, respectively, for the fiscal years 1953 and 1954, shall continue to be authorized to be appropriated for such purposes for the fiscal years 1955 and 1956.

SEC. 6. All provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838); the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, approved June 29, 1948 (62 Stat. 1105); and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785); and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952, approved June 25, 1952 (66 Stat. 158), not inconsistent with this act, shall remain in full force and effect.

SEC. 7. If any section, subsection, or other provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this act and the application of such section, subsection, or other provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 8. All acts or parts of acts in any way inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed, and this act shall take effect on its passage.

SEC. 9. The Secretary of Commerce is hereby directed to make a study in cooperation with the State highway departments and other parties in interest relative to the problems posed by necessary relocation and reconstruction of public utilities services resulting from highway improvements authorized under this act. Among other things, such a study shall include a review and financial analysis of existing relationships between the State highway departments and affected utilities of all types, and a review

of the various State statutes regulating existing relationships, to the end that a full and informative report may be made to the President for transmittal to the Congress of the United States not later than February 1, 1955.

SEC. 10. The term "highway," as defined in section 2 of the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921 (42 Stat. 212), as amended and supplemented, shall be deemed to include "tunnels."

SEC. 11. The Secretary of Commerce may approve as a part of the Federal-aid secondary system, extensions through urban areas, connecting points on that system, provided that Federal participation in projects on such extensions shall be limited to urban funds.

SEC. 12. For the purpose of expediting the interstate planning and coordination of a continuous Great River Road and appurtenances thereto traversing the Mississippi Valley from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico in general conformity with the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and with the recommended plan set forth in the joint report submitted to the Congress November 28, 1951, by the Secretaries of Commerce and Interior pursuant to the act of August 24, 1949 (Public Law 262, 81st Cong.), there is hereby authorized to be expended by the Secretary of Commerce from general administrative funds not to exceed \$250,000; the amount expended under this section shall be apportioned among the 10 States bordering the Mississippi River in proportion to the amount allocated by these respective States for the improvement and extension of existing sections of this highway project as approved by the Secretary of Commerce in cooperation with other public agencies concerned therewith.

SEC. 13. This act may be cited as the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954."

Mr. DONDERO (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman have any idea how much time we will have for debate before we are shut off?

Mr. DONDERO. There is no disposition on the part of the chairman to shut off debate.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I know there is no such disposition on the part of the gentleman, but I want to know if we can have some time, because there are some things that should be discussed on this bill.

I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, and I certainly will not object, I wonder if in the opinion of the members of the committee on that side we might finish the legislation tonight, and set a time of not later than 6 o'clock, we will say, for closing debate.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Of course, there is no disposition on this side of the aisle that I know of to extend debate on the bill. I see no reason why we cannot conclude it tonight. I suggest that we proceed and see how we come out, and then consider closing debate.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, the immediate request will of course be granted, and certainly, as the chairman has pointed out, there is no disposition to shut off debate. However, in scheduling the program for the week, it was my understanding after consultation generally that we could conclude the matter today. I am very sure that we can. I have checked at the desk and there are three amendments there. That does not necessarily mean that there are not other amendments that will be offered, because Members may have amendments that are not at the desk. If Members do have amendments, if they would send them to the desk we could tell better how we could proceed in order to grant plenty of time for the discussion of the amendments that may be offered.

I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DEMPSEY:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$600,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$700,000,000."

Page 2, line 3, strike out "\$270,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$315,000,000."

Page 2, line 5, strike out "\$180,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$210,000,000."

Page 2, line 7, strike out "\$150,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$175,000,000."

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. In view of the fact that it is proposed to continue the gasoline tax at 2 cents, we will build up an additional fund of about \$500 million from the 1st of February of this year until the 1st of July of next year. There is nothing in this bill we have before us which provides for sending any money before the fiscal years 1956 and 1957. The amount of money in addition that I am asking is \$100 million to be given to these categories that have not been treated very generously in this bill. They are the primary system, the secondary system, and the urban system. The primary system would get an additional \$45 million, on the same ratio as they would under the formula now. The secondary system would get \$30 million and the urban system would get \$25 million. That is the formula that has been in effect for a great many years. Everybody who speaks about highways is concerned about the accidents we have been having and the lack of funds we need to do the job that has to be done. If we want to be sincere about this thing, I do not believe we should continue for another year and 3 months with not one additional dime for highways in view of the increase in accidents. We should provide something additional for 1956-57. That is all there is to this amendment. It affects every segment of this Nation. It affects all people. It provides the same formula that we have been working on for a great many years. I think the money is available and I do not see any excuse not to adopt this amendment.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Chairman, is it the purpose of the gentleman to take that \$100 million from the \$200 million provided in section 2?

Mr. DEMPSEY. It has nothing to do with that at all. This is just an additional \$100 million. This amendment has nothing to do with that.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, you are seeking to set this up one year?

Mr. DEMPSEY. No, I am asking to set up an additional \$100 million for each of the fiscal years 1956-57. And I hope we may get some of that back before that time.

Mr. DONDERO. That means that you want to increase the bill by \$100 million.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is right. It may be that we will get the authority to use some of it earlier, but the bill we are considering now, notwithstanding what the President said about the highway accidents, what he said about these killings on the highways, and what he said about using this gasoline tax for construction, does not provide sufficient money to do the job, in my opinion. The funds authorized by this amendment will at least help out and help in the categories that have not been given anything in a great many years. You set up \$50 million for many, many years for that category.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. STEED. Do I understand the main purpose you have here in asking for this \$100 million increase is due to the fact that for the next year or slightly more than 1 year you are going to continue to collect the 2-cent gasoline tax?

Mr. DEMPSEY. For 1 year and 3 months.

Mr. STEED. And that money will be spent on building roads?

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is right. I am asking for \$100 million additional for 15 months, and I think we should use some of it.

Mr. STEED. If your amendment is adopted, then in these 2 following years you are going to have a total of \$200 million additional?

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is right.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. MCGREGOR. It is my understanding the gentleman is talking about the 3 categories where the States match funds on a 50-50 basis?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes, that is right.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I am certain the gentleman has listened to the testimony. There were a number of States wondering whether they would be able to match the funds that we have established here in this bill to say nothing of matching any additional funds.

Mr. DEMPSEY. May I point out to the chairman that if there are any States

that cannot match it, they are not required to match the funds. But, if they can match the funds—and I am sure they would if they were given the opportunity—we are giving them another year to do so. Certainly, they will be able to match the funds. The gentleman is trying to predict what the States will do. The Bureau of Public Roads told you that they have not failed yet.

Mr. MCGREGOR. But you do have on record the fact that there are other States that cannot match the amount that we have in the bill now before us. The gentleman knows, if he is making assurances, as he suggested, that we have no assurance as to what the gasoline-tax income for the coming year is going to be. As of now, it is \$906 million without any increase. I would ask the gentleman in all sincerity, because I know he believes in a balanced budget, where are we going to get this extra \$100 million?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will tell the gentleman where we can get this extra \$100 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DEMPSEY was given permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. DEMPSEY. I got my figures primarily from the chairman, who stated to the Rules Committee that we had \$100 million or more last year. He also stated that it was increasing at the rate of about 5 percent per year. So there would be \$45 million more in 1 year, or \$56 million in 15 months.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will yield to my chairman.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman understands that we are stepping up this bill now over \$225 million above what it was at any previous time. We did that for the purpose of practically absorbing all of the gasoline tax. We are within \$31 million of it now. If the gentleman's amendment prevails, we would go a way beyond that.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman has put in \$70 million that he knows is not going to be appropriated. They are not matching funds with the Federal Government. They have to do with Indian roads, and with parks, and such things as that, which really do not come before the committee. They do not represent a matching proposition. They are in the same category as in 1952.

Mr. DONDERO. But the money comes out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The money comes out of the Federal Treasury, certainly. But you are delaying this action for a year and 15 months. That is what you are doing, if you do not appropriate this money until 1956 or 1957. With all of this gasoline tax money coming in, under your own figures it will be close to \$500 million and we will not be doing anything about building roads.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

(Mr. DEMPSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The question of the amount of money provided for roads in this bill has been considered thoroughly by the members of the committee. That was done before we reported it to the House. No one suggested that we should increase the amount of the bill. If the gentleman's amendment were adopted, we would be authorizing more money than is coming into the Federal Treasury from the gasoline tax, if you want to link the question of the gasoline tax with the question of road funds.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MCGREGOR. At no time did my distinguished friend from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY] bring this amendment before the committee. This bill came out of the committee by a unanimous vote. We all recognize that it is not as much as we want, but it is a compromise and my good friend voted for it.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for just a word?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I did everything in my power to get the chairman of the committee and the chairman of the subcommittee to approve more money for urban roads, did I not? The gentleman said that there was no way to do it except by changing the formula. I tried to prevail upon the gentleman to change the formula for the interstate roads, but in what the gentleman has done he has hurt the other category, the primary system of highways. I did every thing in my power to get additional money for these roads, because the amount of money was inadequate. I asked the chairman of the committee if we would have a chance to get some additional money for 1955 and he said, "No." If we can for 1955, we should; if not, for 1956 or 1957; just so the money is available.

Mr. DONDERO. Money is provided in this bill for 1956 and 1957. The question of money for 1954 and 1955 has already been disposed of and the money allocated to the States. The amendment would increase the total another \$100 million.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. DEMPSEY. In January 1953, when we convened I introduced a bill providing for \$200 million for interstate roads. The gentleman put in a bill for \$250 million. I went along with him. I did not want my bill, I wanted his. But he did not do anything about it, and he is not doing anything about it now, except what is in this bill.

Mr. DONDERO. That may be true, but we have done this, we have added to the bill before the House now \$225 million more than any previous bill.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Certainly.

Mr. DONDERO. I think we have gone a long way in increasing the amount of the authorization.

Mr. DEMPSEY. We have done that because of the terrific increase in the gasoline tax we are collecting.

Mr. DONDERO. But this bill takes nearly all the gasoline tax; we are within \$31 million of it.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman's figures are in error.

Mr. DONDERO. I doubt it very much.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Those are not the figures the gentleman has been using.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the House vote down this amendment, because if it is approved we would be providing far in excess of what the present program for roads contains.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. SCUDDER. I just want to make an observation: There is about \$100 million involved in the difference between the highway users' gasoline tax and other forms of tax paid in under this legislation. Now if we do get to a point where they are charging us with linkage, then I think that we would have plenty of opportunity for our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol to bring in an amendment to strike that part out. I think we are on dangerous ground in endeavoring to absorb all this money that comes in from both the users' tax and nonusers' tax.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. We are appropriating money for the years 1956 and 1957. Is it not true that by that time we will have about \$1,200,000,000 in the tax?

Mr. DONDERO. At the rate of increase of 5 percent a year.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Then the fact of the matter is that we would be using up only about \$900 million out of \$1,200,000,000.

Mr. DONDERO. That may be true.

I ask for a vote, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DEMPSEY) there were—ayes 17, noes 59.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: Page 9, line 15, strike out all of section 9 on pages 9 and 10 and insert a new section to be known as section 9 and to read as follows:

"Sec. 9. No part of any appropriation authorized by this act shall be used to defray any part of the cost of relocating, reconstructing, or improving any public utility service."

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment not because I have any desire to change anything that is being done under the present law, but I am fearful of the effect of section 9.

I was rather amazed when the author of this bill told me upon interrogation that there was support in that committee advocating a policy of using a part of the tax money to reimburse or to help pay a part of the cost of construction or

relocation or reconstruction or improvement of public utilities. I think that in this bill unless we take out section 9, you are beginning to establish a policy of paying a part of the expenses which should be borne by the public utilities and which no one ever dreamed would come out of the pockets of the payers of gasoline taxes to help relocate gas lines, electric lines, telephone lines, and what have you. Already the various States are giving free rights-of-way to these utilities, permitting them to tear up along the sides of the highways, the shoulders, if you please, interrupting traffic and causing great inconvenience to the traveling public. We are already doing that.

Here someone is proposing through this study to do something else, and I think we might as well face the situation. We all realize that under this administration no one will deny it is anything but favorable to the public utilities. The Secretary of Commerce could very well next time bring in a report and a recommendation that we allocate a certain percentage of these funds to pay the public utilities for a part of the work which they should do themselves. I say that already we are giving the utilities enough when we grant them the privilege of using the right-of-way and when we subject ourselves to the inconvenience caused thereby.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I think my amendment should be adopted.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GEORGE. Under existing law the utilities that are occupying their own rights-of-way can be reimbursed 50 percent under Federal aid. The gentleman's amendment will fix it so that no money whatever can be paid to the utilities.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. No. If they are occupying their own rights-of-way, yes, but practically all of this right-of-way is along State highways. It is not owned by the utility. They pay nothing for the use of it, they pay no rental or lease, they get it absolutely free, and I am not in favor of taking gasoline tax money to reimburse utilities for doing something they should be doing themselves.

Mr. GEORGE. That is the view of the majority of this committee, but the gentleman's amendment would change existing law.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. No. Under the present law they cannot use these funds for that because the State Highway Department does not include it as a part of the cost of construction. They make no application for Federal funds for that purpose. They are not paying it now and I do not want them to pay it in the future.

Mr. GEORGE. It is considered part of the highway in our State if they are occupying their own right-of-way and is to be charged against construction. If they are on a public right-of-way or on a highway that is an entirely different matter.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The gentleman does not want to use part of this

money to pay a public utility for moving a gas line or a cable line or anything like that, does he?

Mr. GEORGE. Not according to the telegrams I have been getting and according to the hearings. I conducted the hearings on this problem and they did not think I was on that side.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am glad the gentleman is on my side and if that is the case I know he will support my amendment.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. Chairman, we want to be fair with all segments of our economy, whether it is the labor group, the farm group, the utility group or whoever it might be. The committee had under discussion for many days, a proposal that 5 percent of the money authorized under this legislation be used for the relocation of utilities, both private and public. We did have a lot of evidence that there was a possible problem relative to utility relocations. Even those who do not believe in the utility program recognized that. We were informed that some of the small utility groups were made completely bankrupt by the relocation of highway systems. We decided that rather than make it a mandatory provision of 5 percent we would authorize a study in conjunction with the State highway departments and the Secretary of Commerce and other parties in interest. To me this is nothing more than fair.

Next year you can vote on it, whether you think it is right or whether you think it is wrong, but certainly these people are entitled to their term in court. May I say to my distinguished friend that many of the States are using State moneys for doing this very thing? I concur in the statement of my colleague from Kansas, that should this amendment prevail we would have to have some corrective amendments relative to State laws.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee who wrote the bill whether this provision would cover the case of an interstate pipeline company, for instance, transporting petroleum up here to Washington, or natural gas.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I think it would, sir. They would come under the study, because we endeavored to make it broad. You will note "State highway departments and other parties in interest," so that they can report back to the Congress, I think it is, in February 1955.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The gentleman will admit, though, that the Secretary of Commerce already has the authority to make this study, without directing it, and without providing an opening wedge for coming in for this

percentage that you say a member of the committee already endorses.

Mr. MCGREGOR. It is very much in question whether the Secretary of Commerce has authority. He might be going beyond his line of authority to make that investigation and have the right and privilege of calling in other interested parties. I am taking the position that I think they are entitled to a study being made.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. This study would include, would it not, also the small utility districts that are entirely membership propositions; non-profit? For example, a small water district organization may be adjacent to a large city but not a part of the city water system.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I want to say to my distinguished colleague, and I do appreciate his interest, those are the very ones that caused some of the members of our committee to agree even to a study.

Mr. PRIEST. I fully agree with the gentleman, and I hope that the amendment will be rejected and the study be made, because I feel in that particular field there is certainly a case for a very real study to be made as it might affect the small utility districts.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, after some real authorities have spoken on this subject, like the chairman of the subcommittee, I hate to add any remarks here, but I rise in opposition to the amendment and would like to explain the situation with which my home town community is faced. My home town, the growing city of Jacksonville, Fla., owns many of the things which ordinarily are owned by private industry. Jacksonville owns its own public utilities and was faced very recently with a situation which shows up the inequity of the present legislation, because when a Federal highway was built through the center of the city of Jacksonville they paid the railroads for the small disturbance they made for them, but they entirely overlooked the municipal public utilities whose damages ran into millions of dollars. Now, so I am advised, the city of Jacksonville, if they had been placing this Federal highway, would not have placed it where it was placed. As a matter of fact, the State authority and the Federal authorities got together on a location which suited them just fine but it did not suit the city of Jacksonville at all, because this particular location cost the city a great deal of money in requiring the relocation of its utilities. If this location had been moved just a block to the right or to the left, it would not have cost nearly that much money. Should the Federal and the State governments be allowed to come into a city like Jacksonville and tell its public utility that it has to pay out \$2 million for improving

this road which this city would have preferred to be located elsewhere? That does not seem to me to be a proper and just procedure.

The approach to this problem which we of the Jacksonville area are advocating is embodied in H. R. 7897 which I introduced recently in the House. The first section of H. R. 7897 redefines "construction" as used in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 to include "relocation and readjustment of utility facilities necessitated by the construction or reconstruction of the highway." Section 2 of my bill would put nonrailway utilities on an equal basis with railroad facilities, with the same limitation as to Federal funds which may be used for readjusting and relocating nonrailway utility facilities. Section 5 (b) of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 provides a formula where railroads reimburse the United States for a small amount when it has been established that the railroad has received a net benefit from the project. However, there can be no net benefit to nonrailway utility facilities, so this proposed draft leaves the present provisions of law applicable to railway facilities exactly as they are, and adds the new provisos applicable alone to nonrailway utility facilities.

Section 2 of my bill makes the bill applicable only to Federal funds heretofore or hereafter apportioned to the States. This excludes any application of the proposed statute to Federal funds already expended.

Interest in this problem is shown by this committee including section 9 of the bill now before the House.

I believe the committee's study of this problem over the last 3 years and the study now underway by the committee give sufficient foundation for concrete action along the lines of H. R. 7897.

The problem in Jacksonville arising out of the construction of the Jacksonville Expressway is an illustration of the need for this legislation. The expressway is part of the Federal-aid system and as such has been recognized as a project built to defend our country and to facilitate interstate commerce. City officials tell me that the project was well underway before they were advised that these facilities would have to be moved, and that the city would have to bear the expense of relocation. This is an expense of one and a half to two million dollars. This thrusts upon the city the necessity of raising this money either by taxes or by increased utility rates. Both alternatives present complicated and difficult problems.

Briefly, there are several reasons why these expenses should be considered a part of the construction. First, the cost of alterations to railroads is already recognized as a legitimate part of the highway construction costs. There is no logical or ethical reason why such discrimination between railroad and non-railroad utilities should be allowed to continue.

Second, the law as it now stands creates an inequity because in some States this Federal benefit is available and in others it is not. Whatever a State wants to do with its own highway system should

be left up to the State involved, but a Federal benefit should not be withheld from a local utility on the basis of a State's highway policies.

Third, to allow the present condition to continue places a double burden on residents of the localities involved by requiring Federal taxation for support of the Federal highway system and also requiring increased local taxes or utility rates to pay for the Federal function of moving the utilities for the Federal highway.

At this point I include the provisions of H. R. 7897:

H. R. 7897

A bill to amend the laws relating to the construction of Federal-aid highways to provide for equality of treatment of railroads and other public utilities with respect to the cost of relocation of utility facilities necessitated by the construction of such highways by defining the term "construction" to include relocation and readjustment of utility facilities necessitated by the construction or reconstruction of such highways and by prescribing the extent to which Federal funds may be used for the relocation and readjustment of such utility facilities

Be it enacted, etc., That the definition of the term "construction" contained in the first section of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"The term 'construction' means the supervising, inspecting, actual building, and all expenses incidental to the construction or reconstruction of a highway, including locating, surveying, and mapping, costs of rights-of-way, relocation and readjustment of utility facilities necessitated by the construction or reconstruction of the highway, and elimination of hazards of railway-grade crossings."

SEC. 2. Section 5 (a) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: *Provided further*, That the entire cost of relocation and readjustment of nonrailway utility facilities necessitated by the construction or reconstruction of any highway with funds made available under the foregoing provisions of this act also may be paid from Federal funds, except that not more than 50 percent of the right-of-way and property damage costs, paid from public funds, on any such project, may be paid from Federal funds: *Provided further*, That not more than 10 percent of the sums apportioned to any State under the terms of this act for each fiscal year shall be used for the relocation and readjustment of such nonrailway utility facilities, to be expended in accordance with the Federal-Aid Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, and the provisions of this section."

SEC. 3. The foregoing provisions of this act shall be applicable with respect to all Federal funds heretofore or hereafter apportioned to each State for Federal-aid highway projects.

At this point I include a statement by Mayon Haydon Burns, of Jacksonville, in which he was joined by William Madison, city attorney for Jacksonville, both very able city officials:

THE EVER-EXPANDING PROGRAM OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION MAKES REIMBURSEMENT OF COSTS OF READJUSTING UTILITY FACILITIES IMPERATIVE

A serious problem confronts utilities, with the exception of the railroads, whether they be public or private, in connection with the readjustment of their facilities attendant upon the construction and improvement

of highways and railroad grade crossings where related to the improvement of the system of Federal-aid roads. The acceleration of public road construction under the Federal-aid highway program to meet the needs of interstate commerce and the national defense has made the problem one of urgent moment. These roads, containing double lanes, overpasses, underpasses, and cloverleafs require greater widths for rights-of-way and the extensive readjustment of utility facilities to accommodate them has imposed a cost burden that greatly overshadows that necessary to meet local road requirements. Such an imposition on nonrailroad utilities of relocation costs necessarily incurred under the Federal-aid program is unfair, burdensome, and inequitable to the users of utility services who, in the long run, will be forced to bear these costs.

FEDERAL FUNDS ARE AUTHORIZED FOR PAYMENT TO THE RAILROADS OF READJUSTMENT COSTS BUT ARE DENIED, UNDER THE GENERAL PRACTICE, TO ALL OTHER UTILITIES

The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838; U. S. Code Cong. Service, 1944, p. 840) makes no specific provision for payment from Federal funds of any portion of the expense of relocating or readjusting the facilities of utilities which are located within highway rights-of-way and which must necessarily move to accommodate Federal-aid highway projects.

On the other hand, the Federal Aid Highway Act authorizes payment from Federal funds of costs in relocating facilities of railroads which are located within the highway right-of-way and which are included in Federal-aid grade crossing projects. The regulations of the Bureau of Roads relieve the railroads of making any contribution toward the elimination of railway-highway grade crossings in connection with Federal-aid projects, even where applicable State laws impose a duty on the railroads to bear a substantial part of the cost of eliminating such hazards at grade crossings.

Furthermore, the Bureau of Public Roads has consistently refused reimbursement to nonrailroad utilities except where State authorities determine that nonrailroad utilities are relieved of this obligation under State laws.

This ruling of the Bureau of Public Roads has prevailed even where the relocation of non-railroad-utility facilities was necessitated because of railway grade crossing elimination projects.

WHAT HAS BEEN DONE THROUGH CONGRESSIONAL ACTIVITY TO RELIEVE THE INEQUITABLE BURDEN PRESENTLY IMPOSED ON NONRAILROAD UTILITIES?

At the first session of the present Congress, the Subcommittee on Roads of the House Public Works Committee held extensive hearings under the authority of a resolution authorizing it to make a comprehensive study and review of the highway problem. On July 8, 1953, upon invitation of this subcommittee numerous representatives and spokesmen for public and privately owned utilities and cooperatives appeared before the subcommittee urging the enactment of legislation which would relieve utility users of the inequitable burden attendant upon relocation costs. Heading the list of those who appeared before the subcommittee was the representative of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners which is an organization composed of Federal and State bodies which regulate utility activities and operations.

Among those appearing before the Subcommittee on Roads on this occasion were the representatives of the following organizations:

National Association of Railroad & Utilities Commissioners.

Bell System Telephone Companies.

National Institute of Municipal Law Officers.

American Transit Association.

United States Independent Telephone Association.

American Water Works Association.

Western Union Telegraph Co.

Tennessee Valley Public Power Association.

American Public Power Association.

Kansas City Power & Electric Co.

City of Nashville Public Works Department.

Michigan Consolidated Gas Co.

American Gas Association (Syracuse Suburban Gas Co., Inc.).

Consolidated Gas, Electric Light & Power Co. of Baltimore.

National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co.

Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co.

Dayton Power & Light Co.

Marietta Electric Co.

Ohio Edison Co.

Toledo Edison Co.

Columbus & Southern Ohio Electric Co.

There is now pending before the Public Works Committee of the Senate a bill introduced by Senator JOHNSON of Colorado (S. 1108), the purpose of which is to authorize reimbursement to nonrailroad utilities, of relocation costs incurred in connection with Federal-aid highway projects. This measure is similar to bills introduced in the 82d Congress by Senator McKellar and Representative DAVIS, both of Tennessee. No action was taken on S. 1108 by the committee during the 1st session of the 83d Congress.

ARGUMENTS ADVANCED BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ROADS BY REPRESENTATIVES OF AFFECTED UTILITY GROUPS

I

The added costs and expenses made necessary by the relocation of utility facilities to accommodate Federal-aid highway projects constitutes a burden which must, in the final analysis, be borne by the subscriber, since the expense of furnishing utility services can only be realized through rates charged to and collected from subscribers of utility services.

The former Commissioner of Public Roads, Hon. Thomas H. MacDonald, in supporting the law authorizing reimbursement from Federal funds to railroads, stated, in testimony before the House Public Works Committee in 1944: "If funds were contributed by the railroads they would have to come from their earnings; that is, they would have to be gathered from the public." (Hearings before Committee on Roads, House of Representatives, 78th Cong., 2d sess., on H. R. 2426, vol. 2, p. 968.)

It is strongly urged that the same reasoning applies with equal force to users of non-railroad utility services.

II

Utilities use the highway rights-of-way through grants of franchise rights by State and local governments. These grants were not made just to favor the utilities but that the public welfare might be enhanced through the development and extension of utility services throughout the several States. The use of the highways for utility purposes is a proper public purpose and function and is in the public interest.

Utility development would be retarded greatly and rates would be prohibitive for many citizens if utilities were forced to acquire private rights-of-way for a function essentially public in nature.

III

The use of Federal funds for Federal-aid highway purposes is primarily justified on the theory that these highways are constructed in the interest of national defense and interstate commerce for the general welfare. Taxes levied on the general public provide the funds thus expended. The non-

railroad utility subscriber, as a member of the general public pays his fair share of all Federal taxes, but must also pay, through rates charged for services, all costs and expenses incurred for the relocation of the utilities facilities. Thus the nonrailroad utility user makes a double contribution to the cost of Federal-aid highway construction—once in taxes and again in rates. He is thereby doubly taxed. Such a discrimination between classes of taxpayers is completely unjustified and discriminatory.

IV

The relocation of nonrailroad utility facilities is necessitated only because of the construction or reconstruction of a Federal-aid highway or railroad grade crossing in order to meet needs of the general traveling public. Utility subscribers receive no greater benefits from Federal-aid highway construction than any other user of the highway; no improvement in service results. Hence, relocation costs should be treated as a part of construction costs of the highway just as any other cost. For many years Congress has given recognition to this principle in connection with the relocating of railroad facilities. A different treatment for nonrailroad utilities is wholly unjustified.

V

There can be no argument against reimbursement of railroads for relocation costs in connection with Federal-aid highway projects. But thus relieving one utility, the railroads, of a burden left to be borne by other utilities is beyond defense on any sound basis. This unfair and inequitable discrimination is compounded when we consider that the railroad facilities create a hazard to the traveling public, but the facilities of other utilities are quite harmless from the standpoint of public safety.

It has been said that railroads should be reimbursed because their facilities are situated within private rights-of-way. If this were uniformly true the railroads would not need the benefit of Federal legislation since their rights would be protected under the eminent domain laws. Actually, whether the railroad facilities are on public or private right-of-way at the site of the highway-railway grade crossing is immaterial. The point is that virtually all States impose on railroads an obligation to bear all or a substantial part of the cost of relocating their facilities at railroad-grade crossings irrespective of whether the railroad is on public or private right-of-way. The theory of these statutes is that the railroad creates the hazard to the public required to be eliminated, which justifies the imposition of these special burdens on them. Yet, the Federal-Aid Highway Act expressly relieves the railroads of that liability and provides reimbursement to the railroads for any relocation costs incurred by them in connection with Federal-aid projects. These circumstances further illustrate the justification for authorizing reimbursement to nonrailroad utilities of the relocation costs incurred by them in connection with Federal-aid projects.

VI

As a result of the expansion of the Federal-aid highway system, the problem of relocation cost is becoming serious to nonrailroad utilities. Roads geared to the needs of the national defense and interstate commerce replace local and State roads. The new and elaborate highways require greatly widened rights-of-way. The extensive relocation of utility lines, required by these superhighways, imposes on subscribers to utility services a substantial cost far in excess of that required to accommodate roads of a character suitable for local needs only.

VII

In recent years many States have passed statutes providing for the construction of freeways or turnpikes. These freeways or

turnpikes are similar in size and character to Federal-aid highways. The State legislatures which have enacted such legislation have recognized that public utilities should be fully reimbursed for relocation costs made necessary by the construction of such freeways or turnpikes. The following States have acted in such a manner: Florida (1953), Georgia (1952), Kansas (1950), Kentucky (1953), Michigan (1953), New Jersey (1948), New York (1946), North Carolina (1951), Ohio (1949), Oklahoma (1953), Texas (1953), and Virginia (1952).

Hence, it may be observed that recognition is being accorded to the changing character of modern roadways as they affect the use and placement of utility facilities.

So many inquiries have been made by members of congressional committees, and properly so, regarding the costs involved in relocating nonrailroad utility facilities that for the purpose of developing information on the subject the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners suggested that a study be made to determine such costs. Twelve representative States were selected and certain information was obtained by committees composed of representatives from the various utilities both publicly and privately owned.

The study encompassed all Federal-aid highway projects completed in a recent 12-month period as well as the cost borne by each utility as a result of relocating facilities to accommodate each Federal-aid project excluding any cost resulting from improvement or betterment of the particular facilities.

This study reveals that the cost to all nonrailroad utilities of relocating facilities to accommodate Federal-aid highway projects was 2.34 percent of the total cost of such projects. While these costs pose serious problems for individual utilities, and their subscribers, they constitute a very small part, indeed, of the total cost of constructing Federal-aid highways.

Some suggestion was made during the course of the hearings in July before the Subcommittee on Roads that the exercise of greater care by highway authorities in the selection of routes would reduce the expense of relocation of nonrailway utility facilities below the figure mentioned in the preceding paragraph. Nothing could greater encourage such a result than the enactment of legislation authorizing reimbursement to the nonrailroad utilities of their relocation costs.

It has been contended that this cost added to the annual cost of the Federal-aid program would reduce the miles of roads which could be constructed. This argument overlooks every equitable principle involved in the matter. With equal force and justification it could be argued that private property owners should not be compensated from Federal funds because this likewise would reduce the funds which would otherwise be available for highway construction purposes. It is difficult to comprehend how such an argument could justify the unfair burden presently imposed on the subscribers of nonrailroad utility services who are forced to make a double contribution toward the cost of construction of Federal-aid highways, whereas they receive no benefits in excess of those received by the members of the public who only contributed once.

I would like to conclude by saying I certainly hope that the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] will be defeated, because this study is very greatly needed. I personally feel that much more than this should be done. I think the testimony before the committee shows that public utilities certainly need assistance at this time.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SCUDDER. Complaint was made before the committee that the engineers had put in a subterranean bypass where they might have relocated it somewhere else and put in an overpass. The plan of putting in the subterranean bypass disturbed all the utilities and caused a great amount of expense to the utility owners. If such a bill were passed it might result in the engineers being a little more careful how many utility lines they disturbed.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I thank the gentleman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: On page 4, line 18, after "following manner", strike out the remainder of line 18 and all down to and including the word "system" in line 24 and insert the following: "In the manner now provided by law for apportionment of funds for the Federal-aid primary system: *Provided*, That no State shall receive less than three-fourths of 1 percent of the money so apportioned."

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is merely to restate what I consider a successful operation under the apportionment of money under the present law. It is conceded that this change in apportionment is based one-half upon the population of the State and the other half upon the amount of roads in the respective States. My amendment, instead of taking one-half on the population and one-half on roads, would make it conform to the present law, where you take into consideration the three separate factors, the area, the roads, and the population.

I believe the Committee should consider that, this being a national defense highway, and that is what I understand the object and purpose of it is, a road in a sparsely settled part of the country is as essential as in other sections of the country. The best way I can illustrate it is that when the attack on Pearl Harbor occurred in 1941, when the roads were not able to carry much of the military equipment, the railroads out my way were loaded day after day and day after day with a full right-of-way of military equipment going to the west coast.

If the object and purpose of this legislation, and that is what they told me in the Committee here a moment ago, is to provide national defense highways, then why cannot we make it on a formula that will assure us that we will have an adequate highway defense system?

May I point out to this Committee that in my State of Colorado, where you have the Continental Divide from Wyoming down to New Mexico you have a large range of mountains. We have 661 miles in the State of Colorado. If you are going to have a national defense highway, you are going to have to have some money to take care of those mountains and those problems.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The purpose of the gentleman's amendment would be to take the \$200 million interstate which we provide additionally in this bill and have it come under the existing formula as it stands now under the old law?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is right.

Mr. DONDERO. One-third, one-third, and one-third?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is right, because I think that the experience of this legislation since it was first enacted has proven that to be equitable and fair.

Mr. DONDERO. That would in no way recognize the populated sections of the country like the large cities where 40 percent of the traffic originates.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Except that you have changed the formula here where the Federal Government contributes 60 percent of the funds without the 50-50 basis, as I understand it, and now it is a 60-40 proposition. You have made available, as I believe you pointed out a moment ago in this bill, approximately \$250 million more than at any other particular time to help take care of that situation. Now if you found the necessity of getting additional funds, as we are in this legislation, why do you want to change the formula which everybody has felt is satisfactory? That is the purpose of my amendment, and I feel it would supply a sufficient sum to the populated areas.

Mr. DONDERO. Of course, this matter was discussed at great length in committee, and I admit it comes to the floor as a matter of compromise. We divided the money—\$100 million for the interstate system and \$100 million to the urban centers.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I compliment the gentleman. I know he has made a tremendous study of this problem and has come up with the formula that we have in this bill. I merely want to point out that with the wide spaces and with the tremendous amount of work you have to go through in building these roads through the mountains, if you are going to have any particular east-west national defense highways, then let us make adequate provisions for them. I think this amendment does so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHERER as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: On page 4, line 18, strike out all the language beginning with the word "following" down to and including the word "system" in line 24 and insert "ratio which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States as shown by the latest available Federal census: *Provided*, That no State shall receive less than three-fourths of 1 percentum of the sum authorized to be apportioned each year under this subsection."

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment, provides that the \$200 million allocated for the interstate system

be distributed on a population basis. I am going to repeat some of the things I said during the debate on the rule. The American Association of State Highway Officials, as I said before, recognizes that one of the most serious road problems in this country is the deplorable condition of the interstate system, which although it represents only 1 percent of the total road mileage in this country carries 20 percent of the traffic. These highway officials and the Department of Defense found that this system must be improved at once if it is to meet the future emergency needs and the present day commercial requirements of this country. They made an exhaustive study to determine how this system could best be improved. They came to the conclusion that the interstate system must be improved uniformly throughout the country. You cannot improve it in Colorado and in New Jersey and let it deteriorate in New Mexico. It must be a uniform improvement. It is not a question of miles or area. It is a matter of costs. The State highway officials of this country, who know more about highway problem than anyone else, proceeded to make a study on this basis. They determined the total cost necessary to bring this system up to the standards required to meet the defense needs of this country and also the commercial needs. They went further in this study and found out that the cost of doing this job in eight of the most populated States, is 51½ percent of the total cost, while the cost in the remaining 40 States is only 48½ percent of the total.

The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS] forgets that you must take into consideration costs; that in the industrial areas or the highly populated States the average cost per mile of construction of these interstate highways is 7½ times the cost in the rural areas. As I said before the highway officials of 46 States, each State having 1 vote, recommend to this Congress that we distribute all of this money for the interstate system on a population basis.

You have to consider that there is an additional \$600 million distributed on the old formula under which the so-called rural States get the break. They get a tremendous break on the distribution of the \$600 million otherwise provided for in this bill.

Lastly, if we do what the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS] wants, we are going to have this result. The States where it costs 51½ percent of the total cost to do this job are going to get only 32.4 percent of the \$200 million. The States where the cost is only 48½ percent of the total cost are going to get 67.6 percent of the \$200 million. If we are going to do this job properly, as the State highway officials recommend and as the Defense Department says, you have got to distribute the \$200 million on a population basis.

(Mr. SCHERER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendments.

Mr. Chairman, you can see what this committee has been going through for

several months. I want to say in all sincerity that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS] made an excellent statement in behalf of the rural areas. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER] made an excellent statement in behalf of the urban areas. If we had enough money to give them both what they want, I am sure the chairman would have more friends. But this bill, after weeks of discussion, came out, as I have said, a compromise right down the middle; that is, \$200 million is authorized, \$100 million of it being distributed on the basis of population, as desired by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER], and \$100 million distributed on the formula of one-third, one-third, and one-third, as suggested by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

I do not know of any fairer way to do it, and I hope that this committee will agree with the committee that has submitted this proposal that it is a fair distribution, because we recognize the needs of both and we cannot give either one of them all the money that they might wish.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the distinguished floor leader.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to commend the chairman and all the members of the committee for the magnificent job they have done in bringing this bill before us. I think it is highly desirable from the standpoint of the interests of the country.

As to these amendments, what the gentleman has said is obviously correct. There are differences of opinion; but the committee, in my view, has done a good job of trying to work out a fair median balance. I agree with the gentleman that both of these amendments should be voted down.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I thank the distinguished floor leader. I might say that the district of the gentleman from Ohio would probably get more money if we were to base the distribution on population, but I am trying to be fair. We are distributing it one-half on the basis of population and one-half on the basis of the old formula—a compromise recognizing the needs and problems of both rural as well as urban areas.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. DONDERO. Is it not a matter of fact that it was thoroughly discussed, that those gentlemen from the populous States could have taken the selfish point of view and insisted upon the full \$200 million being distributed on a basis of population? But in order to compromise the matter in committee and bring the bill to the floor we yielded in our view.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I think the gentleman's statement is equally applicable to the members of the committee from rural districts. They, too, could have been selfish and asked for the \$200 million on the basis of area, but we agreed on 50 percent and that is what this legislation provides.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I want to call to the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee and also of the full committee that a number of us from the smaller States supported the amendment in the subcommittee and in the full committee. We are united in opposing both amendments presented here and hope the committee bill will be voted up.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Will the gentleman tell me whether his committee took any testimony bearing upon the question of grade-crossing elimination?

Mr. MCGREGOR. No. We discussed grade-crossing eliminations as far as railroads and toll roads were concerned, but we made no change in the existing law relative to grade-crossing eliminations.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. That is the 1952 act provides that State highway commissions may in their discretion use some of these funds for this purpose, as I understand.

Mr. MCGREGOR. That is correct.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. And this bill does not change that in any way.

Mr. MCGREGOR. We did not change it in any way; and I think that the committee will agree with me.

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. OAKMAN. I agree with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR]. I would like very much to see the substitute offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER] carried, for in my district we are building a hundred miles of the interstate system at a cost of \$8 million a mile, over a total cost of \$800 million. Out in the open country that is equivalent to 4,000 miles of road. So from the standpoint of equity I should have to go along with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER], but realizing that good legislation is usually a matter of compromise I lend my voice to that of the chairman, hoping now that both of these amendments will be defeated, and that the committee bill will be approved.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I thank the gentleman very much.

I want to reiterate my hope that the substitute amendment offered by my friend from Ohio be defeated, as well as the amendment offered by my friend from Colorado so that we may go down the line and be equitable in the distribution of the funds authorized in this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Page 5, line 10, change the colon to a period and strike out all that follows through line 20.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I reluctantly approved the extension of the 2-cent-a-gallon Federal gasoline-tax rate enacted in 1951. I did this only because I was convinced that there was no other recourse. The extreme revenue needs of the Federal Government made it impossible to carry out the scheduled reduction in this tax.

However, I certainly cannot condone the clause in this bill, which would connect the Federal gasoline tax with the grants for the interstate-highway system.

The Federal gasoline tax is a general-revenue tax, imposed upon all uses of gasoline. It never has been in any way connected with highways or with the use of the highways.

A 1-cent-per-gallon tax was imposed in 1932 as a 1-year temporary emergency measure to balance the budget. It has been extended, reenacted, and increased for other general-revenue emergency purposes. In 1940 the tax was increased to 1½ cents a gallon to raise revenue for the national-defense buildup. In 1951 the rate went up to 2 cents as part of the series of tax increases prompted by the Korean war. The Ways and Means Committee has recommended that this 2-cent increase be continued to meet the present unavoidable revenue needs of the Federal Government.

It may be, and I am sure we all hope it will be, possible to reduce this tax as general revenue needs abate. But certainly I do not think it would be either proper or wise for us to nail this tax into the Federal highway-aid program. This is my last year on the Committee on Ways and Means. It is the prerogative of the Ways and Means Committee to recommend tax rates to Congress. I do not see how the committee can continue to exercise that prerogative if other committees attempt to link certain taxes with certain programs and specify the rates.

Regardless of what the situation of the country might be or the desires of Congress, some people might contend that we would be bound by the terms of this bill to retain the Federal gasoline tax at 2 cents per gallon at least until September 30, 1955, and that the alternative would be to strip the Federal-aid program of grants for the vital interstate highway system.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal tax on gasoline is not a highway tax either in intent or in effect. Gasoline is not strictly a fuel for highway vehicles. It is used in aviation, in motorboats, in industry, in tractors and other farm machinery.

Take the situation in my State, for example. According to figures of the United States Bureau of Public Roads, nearly 220 million gallons of gasoline were consumed in Iowa for nonhighway

purposes during 1952. That means the Federal gasoline tax costs the people of my State more than \$4 million a year on motor fuel that is not consumed on the highways at all. Furthermore, the Bureau reports that nearly a hundred and ninety-nine million of these gasoline gallons were consumed by farmers in agricultural machinery and equipment used off the highways.

The figures will vary but the facts will be the same for any State that has aviation, boating, factories, or farms.

If we break with precedent and tradition by linking the Federal gasoline tax with any part of Federal highway aid, we will be ignoring the true nature and uses of gasoline. We will be creating a precedent that could bring increasing demands upon us to link other taxes with other Federal programs until at last Congress is deprived of all initiative in the establishment of tax rates.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the full implications of this provision in the bill be seriously weighed. It serves no useful purpose and carries a potential for enduring harm. That is why I believe this amendment to strike that clause out of the bill merits our wholehearted approval.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman, of course, is speaking for the deletion of this provision having to do with the 2-cent gasoline tax. The gentleman is a very important member of the Ways and Means Committee. He is familiar with the fact that the Ways and Means Committee has reported legislation which will be considered on the floor this week providing under a closed rule for continuation of that half-cent excise tax. That was the sole reason, as I understand it, why this provision was written into the pending bill in the beginning.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

(At the request of Mr. PRIEST, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. COLMER. I will ask the gentleman if it is not true that we have every reason to assume, the condition of the Treasury being what it is and the desire of the administration and others to balance the budget, that the other body will also continue that tax when it gets over there?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I expect it to be continued in this present bill.

Mr. COLMER. What we are doing here is setting a precedent, nailing this thing down, linking up the tax with Federal aid to roads?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. The gentleman is correct. As I have stated here, much of the gasoline is used on the farm and off the highways. There is no logic in tying that tax to the road. I might add that I fought against the automotive tax increase in 1951 also, and that yields almost as much money or practically the same amount of money as the gasoline tax. I do not know how this committee happened to single out the gaso-

line tax to tie down for a specific use. I take it it would be just as logical to include the other taxes that are connected with the use of highways. I have always fought against all such earmarking very strongly.

Mr. COLMER. Is there any question in the distinguished gentleman's mind that once this gets into this bill and becomes a part of the legislation but what it will remain there for the rest of the time as permanent legislation?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Yes, and it will be used as leverage against future action by the Committee on Ways and Means or subject that committee to the charge that they are exercising jurisdiction over road building policies if they lower the tax rate on gasoline hereafter.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I agree with the gentleman in the serious question he raised about this. I would like to ask: Does the language there serve any good purpose? Without it, you will still have the same road program, and without it the House will still get an opportunity to act affirmatively on the gasoline tax in the other bill, is that not correct?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. The gentleman is correct, absolutely. The adoption of this amendment will not cut down the authorization at all. It only cuts out the provision tying it to a specific excise tax, which provision does not serve any good purpose.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I notice my distinguished friend was commenting relative to the other body. We hate to lose him, but we hope he goes to the Senate. But, let me call his attention to this fact. He does not know and neither does the present speaker know what they are going to do in the other body. My distinguished friend stated that he was always opposed to this half-cent additional tax. I might ask him, is this his way of trying to do away with the half-cent tax?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. No, this is one of the ways that we might avoid unfair pressure on the Committee on Ways and Means if that committee gives further consideration to a change in the gasoline tax.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Had the committee not voted out the bill, I am sure that is true, but that bill was voted out, so all we are doing now is saying "Give us the revenue and we will give you the roads." I would like to ask the gentleman if we do away with this half-cent tax, where are we going to get the money for those roads?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. I am sure the gentleman will agree that this is an authorization bill. Now, when you come along with an appropriation for these funds for highway purposes, are you certain

that a conditional authorization is going to be sufficient to secure the appropriation? As you well know, a point of order can be made against an appropriation that is not authorized by law. Now you are raising the question about a conditional authorization for an appropriation. The purpose here is to carry on the Federal-State highway program. When you impose a condition of this type, you are establishing a new precedent that might serve to cause difficulty in the future.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I will say that we possibly are establishing a precedent, because we are going to assure the highway users that we are going to spend the money that they pay as a tax on gasoline on roads. That is a precedent.

Mr. COOPER. Why not bring in a bill to that effect? Why jeopardize your Federal-aid highway program by having a questionable provision of this type included in an authorization bill?

Mr. MCGREGOR. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means made the statement awhile ago in which he took exactly the opposite view of the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot agree upon a limitation of time on this amendment and all other amendments to the bill. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto terminate in 10 minutes.

Mr. WITHROW. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, and I shall object, if the gentleman will recall I asked him for time during general debate and I was allocated 3 minutes, and finally I could not use that. I want 5 minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close at 5 o'clock, which will allow 20 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine [Mr. NELSON].

(Mr. NELSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, during the course of the general debate I tried to find out whether or not there was linkage in this bill between this authorization bill and the tax on gasoline. I was assured there was none. If there is not linkage with the gas tax, there certainly is a very well prepared system of cross-reference. This debate well illustrates what happens when you tie in an authorization bill with a particular tax. What we have been debating here today is not so much the need for this Federal aid to highways as where the money is coming from. Thus provisions of the bill have been tied in time after time with the gas tax. It is a function of the Committee on Public Works to authorize needed highway aid. It is up to the Appropriations Committee to find the money.

Once you say that all of the tax from a given source shall be used for highways, it immediately follows that then only the tax from that source will be used for highways. The result is immediately that you cannot meet the needs. The result in this case would be that you could use the gas tax only for highways, and then you would either have to increase the gas tax or let the highways be neglected or, if the gas tax is repealed, cut out Federal aid entirely.

This linkage should not be written into law. If you write it into law in this bill, you will be writing it into law for the first time and setting a definite precedent.

The Federal gas tax is not a tax based on user. This linkage means that in the highway program those from the most populous sections will pay through the gas tax to build highways in the less populous States. Perhaps people would prefer to pay it through the income tax. It would undoubtedly be more equitable. They do not doubt that these highways should be built, but this is a basic question which should not be discussed on a bill like this. We have listened all day to a discussion about interstate highways and the primary duty of the Federal Government to contribute to the cost of construction of such interstate highways. We have been told that the Federal Government has a duty to build these interstate highways, and that we are in crying need of building them, but then the provision this amendment would strike says the Federal Government cannot and will not discharge that duty unless it continues to receive income from the 2-cent gas tax. There could be no more effective argument against linking our Federal-aid program to a particular tax. The principle of linking the gas tax with aid for roads is entirely wrong. It should not be considered in this bill.

The bill is a fine bill otherwise. I compliment the chairman of the committee on it and the chairman of the subcommittee, who have worked very hard to bring this bill out. It is a very excellent job. But let us not set a precedent which may adversely affect our highway program by putting this linkage provision into the bill.

The only reason given for this provision that I have heard is that it will force the other body to vote for extension of the 2-cent gas tax. This result it will not accomplish. But it goes further. It is a direct blow aimed at our many State Governors, who have advocated that the Federal Government get out of the gas-tax field. By this linkage you say to them in effect, "Give up your ideas or you will lose 200 million a year for interstate highways."

The Federal gas tax was never designed to be used only for roads. It should not be so restricted. Nor should the responsibility of the Federal Government for highways be limited to the extent of the revenue that is received from a gas tax, if any.

The gentleman from Ohio asked what the Senate will do with the excise tax. I say the first thing the Senate will do is take this provision out of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN]. It is not necessary for me to recapitulate the arguments these gentlemen have used. They seem to me completely sound.

The use of gasoline is not confined to highways. It would be perfectly logical to say that the proceeds of the gasoline tax should be used for the construction of airports since airplanes use gas. It would be perfectly logical to say that the proceeds of the gasoline tax should be used for harbor improvements, because harbor improvements are utilized by vessels, and vessels nowadays are fueled predominantly by gasoline.

Further, I think it is a thoroughly pernicious precedent to have an attempt made to have one committee of the Congress coerce another committee of the Congress in this way.

I think we ought to vote on highway legislation in a highway bill and on excise tax legislation in a tax bill, appropriately reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. Would it not be just as logical for the gentleman and me and other members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which tomorrow will bring before the House a bill authorizing some appropriations for the hospital construction act, to require that certain revenues from certain excise taxes be used for that purpose insofar as establishing a precedent is concerned?

Mr. HALE. Of course, the whole idea of earmarking, sometimes called dedication, seems to me completely false. Or to take another example, you might say that the automobile excise tax should be used entirely on highways. No proposition of that kind has been made. I have not myself seen the bill, which will be here on Wednesday from the Committee on Ways and Means. Neither I nor anybody else knows what the House will do on that measure, still less what will be done on the measure in the other Chamber or by the Chief Executive.

I append certain telegrams recently received on this legislation:

AUGUSTA, MAINE, March 6, 1954.

HON. ROBERT HALE,

Member of Congress,

House Office Building:

Maine State Grange has repeatedly urged withdrawal of Federal Government from field of gasoline taxation. New Federal Aid Highway Act making portion of Federal aid dependent on continuance of tax at 2-cent level contrary to policy of both National and Maine State Grange. Urge your strong opposition to portion of H. R. 8127 linking Federal aid with motor-fuel tax.

MAYNARD C. DOLOFF,
Master, Maine State Grange.

AUGUSTA, MAINE, March 8, 1954.

Representative ROBERT HALE,

House Office Building:

We urge you to oppose highway-aid legislation which would tie appropriations to Fed-

eral gasoline tax revenue. Federal gasoline tax should be eliminated and left to States and Federal aid to highways should be continued because of national defense, mail delivery, interstate commerce, and general welfare. These are not responsibilities of highway uses alone but of all the people. Farmers can see no reason to pay Federal tax on gasoline used in farming operations.

MAINE FARM BUREAU ASSOCIATION,
C. WILDER SMITH, President, Cutler,
Maine.

PORTLAND, MAINE, March 5, 1954.

HON. ROBERT HALE,

House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

We earnestly request your consideration of our views on H. R. 8127, proposed Federal Aid Highway Act. Section 2A, page 4, printed bill calls for earmarked funds for national system of interstate highways which we have long advocated and hope you will support. Section 2A, page 5, calls for 60 percent matching share for same funds. We urge that this be increased to 75 percent. Same section and page makes earmarked interstate authorization available only if present 2-cent Federal gas tax continued. This involves linkage and is highly undesirable. It would also make Federal-highway aid legislation contingent on tax legislation handled by different congressional committee and would adversely affect urban highway planning. May we have your views.

Thanks.

MAINE AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION.
ARLYN E. BARNARD.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW].

(Mr. WITHROW asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, I favor the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN]. I believe that if we do not adopt the amendment we will be doing that which every Congress since 1932 scrupulously avoided doing. In 1932 the subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means on double taxation had this to say. This was in December of 1932:

When the gasoline tax was first discussed in the House of Representatives, it was felt by many that this field of taxation was fully occupied by the States and should be left to them. The House did not include this tax in the revenue bill as transmitted to the Senate. The Senate, however, in the light of later figures as to deficit and as to the probable tax yield, was obliged to amend the bill by including a tax upon gasoline, and that was accepted by the House.

Then, the following year, during the hearings on the Federal gasoline tax, when it was being considered by the House Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable Robert J. Doughton, who was then chairman of the committee, had this to say. This was in 1933. I quote:

This was an emergency tax measure. I am sure the Congress was reluctant to propose a tax on gasoline, but in order to balance the budget, the Congress felt it was necessary temporarily to impose a tax of 1 cent a gallon on gasoline over the objection of the House. It was passed in the Senate, and we concurred in it because they said the whole structure of government would perish if the budget was not balanced, and we were, too, anxious to balance it, and, consequently, in the rush of

the close of the session of Congress and to balance the budget, we imposed the gasoline tax.

Despite the good intention of the Congress that imposed this temporary tax on gasoline, it was not permitted to expire on schedule. In 1933, the new Congress extended the tax, again on a temporary basis only, and increased its rate to 1½ cents per gallon as part of the National Industrial Recovery Act. Again, there was no pretense that this was a road tax; it was a general revenue tax. The additional one-half cent tax was permitted to expire on December 31, 1933, so the rate reverted to 1 cent per gallon. From then until July 1940, the tax was reimposed again and again at that rate, in order to meet the emergency requirements of a continuing depression.

In 1940 the tax was once more increased to 1½ cents a gallon. The Nation was recovering from the depression; but we now faced the necessity of building our military strength. The tax increase was for this avowed purpose. This tax money was needed for general-fund purposes, and there was no allegation that it was for the purpose of highway aid.

From 1940 until 1951 the tax continued at the 1½-cent rate. The fact that normal highway construction halted completely during the war years and regular Federal highway aid was suspended, serves to emphasize that the Federal gasoline tax had no connection with Federal highway aid.

In November 1951 the Federal gasoline tax was boosted to its present rate of 2 cents per gallon. Here again, the tax increase was not alleged to be for highway aid, but rather as a part of a schedule of general tax increases to raise revenue for the stepped-up defense program occasioned by the Korean war.

The history of the Federal gasoline tax speaks for itself. It shows beyond any possible question that this is and has always been a straight out general revenue tax, imposed and increased to meet general governmental emergencies. This is further emphasized by the fact that the tax applies not only to highway use of gasoline but to all gasoline, including that used in industry and agriculture.

It is a distortion of history to claim that there has ever been the slightest connection between Federal taxation of gasoline and Federal highway aid to the States. It is not only erroneous but even dangerous to suggest that the Federal gasoline tax be linked with future Federal highway aid to the States. The linkage theory upsets the very principle of Federal highway aid and jeopardizes its continuance on a sound basis.

One warning to this effect comes from the Honorable Wilburn Cartwright, who was chairman of the House Roads Committee from 1934 to 1943 and who, along with Senator CARL HAYDEN, was coauthor of a succession of Federal highway aid acts. In 1940, Representative Cartwright made a statement that offers food for reflection to all who espouse Federal gasoline tax linkage. He said:

The participation of the Federal Government in the improvement of highways in cooperation with the States, using general Treasury funds therefor, is amply justified on the grounds of * * * national defense, post roads, and interstate commerce. When the first Federal Aid Road Act was passed in 1916, neither the States nor the Federal Government had levied any special taxes, commonly known as road-user taxes, such as the taxes on gasoline, lubricating oils, and motor vehicles.

I think it is important that these broader reasons for justifying Federal participation in highway construction be not even tacitly abandoned by road advocates by putting too much emphasis on the relationship between road authorizations and road-user tax revenues. There might come a time when these taxes would not be levied, but that would not, in my opinion, remove the justification for further Federal participation in road improvements.

It will be noted that Representative Cartwright mentioned Federal taxes on lubricating oil and motor vehicles, as well as the tax on gasoline. As a matter of fact, there is a whole series of Federal excises on automobiles, trucks and buses, parts and accessories, tires and tubes—which produce over a billion dollars a year in revenue over and above the \$935 million yielded by the Federal gasoline and diesel fuel taxes.

Like the Federal gasoline tax, these automotive excises have no connection whatever with the Federal aid highway program. Like the Federal gasoline tax, they are emergency general excises which have been raised and lowered from time to time without any reference whatever to highway aid grants.

The nature of all these taxes underlines the lack of logic in singling out the Federal tax on gasoline as a highway tax. This fuel is used in farm tractors, boats, stationary engines and aircraft, as well as in vehicles using the highways. The Federal tax is paid on nonhighway use as well as highway use.

The linkage theory logically means that the gasoline tax would become a highway use tax—it means that nonhighway use of gasoline should be exempt from the tax. In the interests of justice, the Federal Government would be obligated to refund the tax on all gasoline used for nonhighway purposes, such as in industry and agriculture. Besides reducing receipts from the tax, this would add enormously to collection costs. It would require the creation of another Federal bureau to process the enormous volume of refund applications.

Consumers who use gasoline on farms and in factories would be burdened with the complex report filing essential to running a tax refund system.

But this would be only one problem of many brought on by tax linkage. With a stepped-up program of Federal highway aid, linked to Federal gasoline tax receipts, it is easy to foresee endless bickering over Federal-aid allocation formulas.

The densely populated, heavily traveled States would demand Federal grants equal to the gasoline tax money collected within their borders. The States with large areas and sparse populations would continue to expect larger-than-average grants because the original purpose of

Federal highway aid was to help them most of all. And this would be only the beginning of the problem. Political subdivisions within each State would be making their demands, too.

A linkage of Federal excise taxes with Federal aid for highways will place Congress in the position of a glorified road commission which will be required to act as referee between the repeated and continuous demands of the several States as well as the political subdivisions within each of the States. Linkage, which on the surface appears to be an easy way out, would create many more problems than it solves. In fact, it would be the beginning of a succession of problems where the referee will never make a decision to the liking of the participants, and the decision will be reappealed and reargued every 2 years. Linkage is not the solution to the problem; rather, it will be the beginning of a multitude of new problems.

If this linkage theory is ever accepted, it will establish a precedent for a rash of other proposals to link other Federal taxes with specific beneficiaries for each tax collected by the Government. Congress has enough problems without borrowing more of them by adopting the linkage theory.

These facts support only one conclusion: Federal gasoline tax linkage is not a program or principle. It is a gigantic fallacy—unfounded in fact and unworkable in practice.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I am going to try to get away from the subject of the particular tax involved because I feel the danger here is the precedent which is being set of trying to tie one particular tax in with any particular purpose. In fact, I question whether it is constitutional to do such a thing. This is just a method of getting around a very basic constitutional provision which as I read it says that taxes may be raised for general revenue purposes. I submit that if you tie it to this, you are going to tie it to other things as we go along, and we are going to disrupt our whole system of taxation completely.

I should like to make one other suggestion to the Committee on Public Works. Although they might think they were putting pressure on the Committee on Ways and Means, it will work in the opposite way because this is, in effect, turning over to the Committee on Ways and Means the power of saying whether or not you are going to have your highway program. Let us not tie in any more taxes with specific programs to give to the Ways and Means Committee additional power. We already have unemployment insurance and social security because this procedure was followed. As a member of that committee I do not believe we want to get into the business of providing roads and of making decisions in this field. I suggest that this amendment be approved and that in the future we do not attempt to tie any particular tax in with a particular program.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me if we do not adopt the committee proposal we are going to do one of two things. We are going to turn down this expanded highway program or else we are going to create a larger deficit in the Federal budget. It resolves itself into something just as simple as that, as far as I am concerned.

During the past several years we have had a diversion of the use tax which in most States they think is to be used on their State and national highway system. It has amounted to between \$400 and \$500 million a year for the last several years. If we, as Members of Congress, had been doing our duty over a period of years, we would have seen to it that that money went back on the highways because the figures show that we have killed more people on our highways in the last 20 years than were killed in our wars. It means that we are not staying on top of our job. I hope the committee will stay with the Committee on Public Works in this proposal, and perhaps we can work out something better 2 years from now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

(Mr. MCCORMACK, by unanimous consent, yielded his time to Mr. HAYS of Arkansas.)

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I am reluctant to take any time at all but, as a minority member of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, I have been impressed with the fact that students of this problem, who are primarily interested in the point of view of the States, are universally opposed to the principle of linkage of the gasoline tax and Federal authorizations. The chairman of the subcommittee has done an excellent job with this bill, and I am for it, and I would not say anything derogatory of the bill as a whole. But I think we could improve this legislation, and I trust that the chairman of the subcommittee will not feel that those of us who offer criticism on this point fail to appreciate the splendid work that has been done by the Public Works Commission. It would set a thoroughly bad precedent if we should adopt the idea of linkage, which could spread to other types of legislation.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the logic of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is irrefutable, and that we will be perfecting this legislation to eliminate the principle of linkage and stick strictly to a Federal-aid program extending to all phases of highway legislation. For that reason I shall support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I have not given a great deal of attention to the merits of this particular amendment. I would like to say just a few words as to the overall meaning of this bill.

It has been testified here today that we lose on our highways annually 33,300

people and that the financial loss is \$3,950,000,000, owing to the inadequacy of our highways. It was also testified, I think by our colleague from the State of Washington, that two-fifths of this loss, both in human life and in property, is due to the inadequacy of our highway system.

Breaking these figures down to date it is something like this: Our financial loss is \$3,950,000,000 per year due altogether to this inadequacy. In 2 years—and we are making this appropriation for 2 years—it is double that, or \$7,950,000,000. These are losses we are dealing with, losses due to inadequacy that this House admittedly is responsible for. Let us think of it, Mr. Chairman. That means that every day, this day in which are living here and discussing this bill 36 people are being killed on our highways on account of things that we have failed to do; that is two-fifths of the entire number. One hundred and more were killed yesterday and today and will be killed tomorrow.

I have heard the argument put forth that there is not enough road equipment in existence to make use of a larger appropriation. I submit that that problem will shortly be solved once an appropriation shall be made. How long, Mr. Chairman, do you suppose it would be if Congress were to double the appropriation proposed in this bill until the manufacturers of road-building equipment would call back on the job the thousands of men recently dismissed from employment? How long would it be until additional facilities for manufacture would be under construction? There is no avenue of increasing business actively and consequent employment equal to this opportunity in existence, because it will result in the immediate saving of human life and property.

I favor the passage of this bill, but I regret that no member of the committee has seen fit to introduce an amendment to double or treble the amount of money to be appropriated. I am convinced the American people would heartily approve such a measure.

(Mr. MILLER of Kansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, if this bill had come to the floor next Wednesday and the bill from the Committee on Ways and Means had been on the floor today, it is quite possible that all the debate and argument we have listened to would not have been heard at all.

As I stated earlier in the day, the half-cent a gallon gasoline tax yields \$225 million a year. If that be not reenacted it means that the income instead of being \$906 million a year would be about \$700 million. Then if this bill be enacted at \$875 million we would far exceed all of the income from the gas tax.

We are saying to the people of this country by this provision—call it linkage if you will—we want to give you good roads; we want to take the money that you paid for using the roads and spend it

on the highways—I mean the gas tax that you pay for the gasoline you buy, we want to take it and spend it on the roads. You cannot spend it if you do not pay it; you cannot spend it if this bill is not passed, to continue the two-cent a gallon tax. The one question that is involved, and that is the old controversy, namely, if you want roads then provide the money to pay for them. If you do not link the half-cent gas tax but still enact this bill you have a spread of \$450 million throwing the budget out of balance more than ever before because the income from such tax would be \$225 million less while the bill provides \$225 million more for roads.

What is wrong with this language? What harm does it do? Should the tax bill be passed as recommended, the language sought to be stricken out would be meaningless. We accomplished what we seek to do—morally to indicate that the money which comes from the gas tax shall be used for the building of roads; but we must have the tax continued if we are to have better highway facilities.

For the reasons stated—I will not take more time, Mr. Chairman—I ask that the amendment be voted down and call for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARTIN of Iowa) there were—ayes 70, noes 70.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. DONDERO and Mr. MARTIN of Iowa.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 80, noes 93.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NICHOLSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8127) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 460, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk, in engrossing the bill H. R. 8127, be authorized to capitalize the word "commerce" on page 3, line 5, to correct a typographical error.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

HOURLY MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

(Mr. HALLECK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, there are no special orders granted for tomorrow after the conclusion of the day's business. I trust that we can, if possible, avoid any special orders because we, on our side, desire to have a conference after the bill is disposed of tomorrow.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was granted permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. VAN PELT asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

EXCISE TAX ON AUTOMOBILES

(Mr. OAKMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the automobile today is as necessary to the average workingman as his dinner pail. On Wednesday of this week the House will have before it H. R. 8224, the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1954. This brings up a measure which in one of its elements contains a gross inequity. This inequity will have a direct material bearing on 1 out of every 7 productive workers in this Nation. This is the number of workers it is said receive their paycheck directly or indirectly from the automotive industry. I believe that, when this inequity is clearly pointed up to the committee, the only course of action would be for the Ways and Means Committee, through its chairman, to offer or accept an amendment to rectify the injustice.

I am speaking of the continuation of the 10-percent excise-tax rate on pas-

passenger cars and the 8-percent excise tax on trucks, buses, trailers, parts and accessories. As it is generally known, by law the excise tax on passenger cars was to have been automatically reduced from 10 percent to 7 percent and on trucks, buses, trailers, parts and accessories from 8 percent to 5 percent on April 1. These 3 percentage points were added to the excise tax on these commodities in 1951. It was clearly recognized by the Congress at that time that these were excessive, temporary rates that in all equity should be reduced when this country was no longer on an extreme emergency basis.

Not only does this bill continue this exorbitant tax but it performs the additional injustice of not establishing a definite cutoff date when such increases will be eliminated.

It has been said that the existence of a termination date on an excise tax in an act of Congress only invites a buyers' strike. An example has been cited to the effect that automobile dealers today have organized to stop accepting deliveries from manufacturers simply because the tax was scheduled to go down April 1. Mr. Speaker, I contend that the simple solution to this phase of a buyers' strike can be accomplished by including in the bill a provision for an automatic refund to the dealers of stocks on hand as of the effective date of the reduction in tax. This has been the case historically upon the termination or reduction of excise taxes.

The question logically follows then, Would there not be a public buyers' strike as opposed to a dealers' buyer strike? The Ways and Means Committee in its report has clearly stated that it is its intention to take another look at the rates on these items next year. Surely the existence of this intention would have as serious an effect on the buying public as the existence of a termination date in the act itself.

In the first session of the 83d Congress, I introduced a bill calling for the complete elimination of excise taxes on the items under discussion—H. R. 3186. I still believe that such action is prudent and proper. Automotive excise taxes are unfair to millions of workers, particularly to the lower-income group who comprise more than 75 percent of the passenger-car owners. They are discriminatory against makers and owners. This is true because the tax is so highly selective and departs from the normal concept of uniformity of treatment. Excise taxes represent a threat to demand and employment. The automobile in our economy is clearly not a luxury but has been proven definitely to be a necessity. The universal high rate of use testifies to this point. As of mid-1953 there was 1 passenger car for every 4 persons in this country or 1 car for every 1.1 families.

Clearly a strong case can be made for the elimination of excise taxes on automotive items, but I am not politically naive enough to think that this action is practicable to the extent of full accomplishment or realization at the moment. Rather, I will content myself with the argument that the inequity and

injustice contained in this bill should be corrected here and now. Surely the arguments for repeal speak eloquently for such correction.

Actually, this represents an inequity heaped on injustice since this same bill provides for a drastic reduction in the excise tax on luxury items. At the same time, an exorbitant rate is continued, not reduced, on automotive items, which are clearly not luxury items. Historically, excise taxes were imposed on automotive items in periods when their purchase was being discouraged because of shortage of materials. Surely, no such argument can be made today and it should be abundantly clear that an incentive rather than a detriment should be given to this vital industry.

We have heard much of an endeavor to obtain a uniform excise or manufacturer's tax on all items produced. The reduction of all excise taxes to a common level, namely, 10 percent, contained in this bill begins to look like a move in the direction of a standard excise tax. Can it be that this is the basic reason for the refusal to accept a termination date on these 3 percentage points on automotive items? If so, surely this is not the proper solution to this problem. Such a tax must be measured in the light of all the circumstances and in totality, and then only with due deliberation.

It is, therefore, my contention that the Committee should adopt an amendment to this bill, H. R. 8224, which would provide for the automatic reduction not later than April 1, 1955, of the tax on passenger cars from 10 percent to 7 percent, and on trucks, buses, trailers, parts, and accessories, from 8 percent to 5 percent. In addition, this amendment should provide that stocks of such items in the hands of dealers on said date will be the subject of a tax refund.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

(Mr. SIEMINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. SIEMINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

INCREASED SECURITY FOR THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL AND THE CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks and include a

joint resolution just introduced by her.)

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one week ago the membership of the House was subjected to the tragic shooting from the gallery by fanatical Puerto Ricans who made the trip down from New York in order to murder Members of Congress. It did not make any difference to them whether they were located in the House or in the Senate. Their purpose was to inflict mortal injury upon Members of Congress.

I am tremendously pleased the Members that were injured by the fusillade of bullets which were fired by these terrorists are going to completely recover and will soon again be here with us in this honorable association. Also, I am thankful to God more of the membership were not injured and that none of those who were shot were mortally wounded.

During this week that has passed, I have given tremendous thought to the problem emphasized by this tragic occurrence. By way of conclusion to these thoughts, I have filed today a joint resolution having as its purpose the protection of the Congress of the United States, as well as the United States Capitol and its grounds. It is my view that the recommendations I have suggested in this joint resolution, if adopted by the Congress, would prove to be very effective in accomplishing the desired security for Members of Congress and for the United States Capitol.

It is to be noted that in this resolution of mine, I have made the requirement that no person shall be permitted to enter the Capitol Building unless that person has answered in the negative as to whether or not he is a Communist or a member of the Communist Party.

House Joint Resolution 464

Joint resolution to provide increase security for the United States Capitol and for the Congress

Resolved, etc., That a Board to be known as the Capitol Security Board is hereby created. The Capitol Security Board shall be composed of the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, 3 Members of the Senate of the United States to be appointed by the Vice President, 3 Members of the House of Representatives of the United States to be appointed by the Speaker, the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, the Sergeant at Arms of the House, and the Architect of the Capitol. The Capitol Security Board shall be responsible for the complete security of the United States Capitol Building and grounds, and the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 2. (a) That an office to be known as the Security Office of the Capitol is hereby created. The Security Office of the Capitol shall be headed by a Security Officer of the Capitol who shall be appointed by, and shall perform his duties under the supervision of, the Capitol Security Board. There shall be in such office a Deputy Security Officer of the Capitol, two Assistant Security Officers of the Capitol, and such other assistants and employees as may be necessary to enable the Security Officer of the Capitol to carry out his duties under this Act.

(b) The Security Officer of the Capitol, the Deputy Security Officer of the Capitol, and Assistant Security Officers of the Capitol shall be trained in the arts and sciences of security operations.

(c) The Capitol police shall be subject to the authority and control of the Security Officer of the Capitol.

83^D CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 8127

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 9 (legislative day, MARCH 1), 1954

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Public Works

AN ACT

To amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the
4 Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat.
5 355), and all Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary
6 thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the
7 sum of \$600,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,
8 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30,
9 1957.

1 The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be
2 available for expenditure as follows:

3 (a) \$270,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid pri-
4 mary highway system.

5 (b) \$180,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid sec-
6 ondary highway system.

7 (c) \$150,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid
8 primary highway system in urban areas, and for projects
9 on approved extensions of the Federal-aid secondary system
10 within urban areas.

11 The sums authorized by this section for each fiscal year,
12 respectively, shall be apportioned among the several States
13 in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with
14 the formulas set forth in section 4 of the Federal-Aid High-
15 way Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat.
16 838).

17 Any sums apportioned to any State under the provi-
18 sion of this section shall be available for expenditure in
19 that State for two years after the close of the fiscal year
20 for which such sums are authorized, and any amount so
21 apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period
22 shall lapse: *Provided*, That such funds for any fiscal year
23 shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to
24 the total of the sums apportioned to the State for such
25 fiscal year is covered by formal agreements with the Sec-

1 retary of Commerce for the improvement of specific projects
2 as provided by this Act: *Provided further*, That in the case
3 of those sums apportioned to any State for projects on the
4 Federal-aid secondary highway system, the Secretary of
5 Commerce may discharge his responsibility relative to the
6 plans, design, inspection, and construction of such secondary
7 road projects upon his receipt and approval of a certified
8 statement by the State highway department setting forth
9 that the plans, design, and construction for such projects are
10 in accord with the standards and procedures of the respective
11 States applicable to projects in this category approved by
12 him: *Provided further*, That not more than 25 per centum
13 of the amount apportioned to each State under subpara-
14 graphs (a), (b), or (c) of this section may be transferred
15 from the apportionment under one subparagraph to the
16 apportionment under either of the other subparagraphs:
17 *Provided further*, That such transfer is requested by the
18 State highway department and is approved by the Secretary
19 of Commerce as being in the public interest: *Provided fur-*
20 *ther*, That the total of such transfers shall not increase
21 the original apportionment under any subparagraph by
22 more than 25 per centum: *Provided further*, that the trans-
23 fers hereinabove permitted for funds authorized to be appro-
24 priated for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1956, and
25 June 30, 1957, shall likewise be permitted on the same

1 basis for funds heretofore or hereafter authorized to be ap-
2 propriated for any prior or subsequent fiscal year: *And pro-*
3 *vided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be deemed
4 to alter or impair the authority contained in the last proviso
5 to subparagraph (b) of section 3 of the Federal-Aid High-
6 way Act of 1944.

7 SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of expediting the construc-
8 tion, reconstruction, and improvement, inclusive of necessary
9 bridges and tunnels, of the national system of interstate high-
10 ways, including extensions thereof through urban areas,
11 designated in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of
12 the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838),
13 there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional
14 sum of \$200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,
15 1956, and a like additional sum for the fiscal year ending
16 June 30, 1957. The sum herein authorized for each fiscal
17 year shall be apportioned among the several States in the
18 following manner: one-half in the ratio which the popula-
19 tion of each State bears to the total population of all the
20 States, as shown by the latest available Federal census:
21 *Provided*, That no State shall receive less than three-fourths
22 of 1 per centum of the money so apportioned; and one-half
23 in the manner now provided by law for apportionment of
24 funds for the Federal-Aid primary system: *Provided further*,

1 That the Federal share payable on account of any
2 project on the national system of interstate highways provided
3 for by funds made available under the provisions of this sec-
4 tion shall be increased to 60 per centum of the total cost
5 thereof, plus a percentage of the remaining 40 per centum of
6 such cost in any State containing unappropriated and unre-
7 served public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual
8 and tribal, exceeding 5 per centum of the total area of all
9 lands therein, equal to the percentage that the area of such
10 lands in such State is of its total area: Provided fur-
11 ther, That the Secretary of Commerce shall not ap-
12 portion to the States the sum authorized by this section
13 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, unless a Federal
14 excise tax on gasoline in the amount of not less than 2 cents
15 per gallon is in effect on September 30, 1954; and the Secre-
16 tary of Commerce shall not apportion to the States the sum
17 authorized by this section for the fiscal year ending June 30,
18 1957, unless a Federal excise tax on gasoline in the amount
19 of not less than 2 cents per gallon is in effect on September
20 30, 1955.

21 (b) Any sums apportioned to any State under the pro-
22 visions of this section shall be available for expenditure in
23 that State for two years after the close of fiscal year for which

1 such sums are authorized: *Provided*, That such funds shall be
2 deemed to be expended upon execution of formal agreements
3 with the Secretary of Commerce for the improvement of
4 specific projects under this section.

5 (c) Any amount apportioned to the States under the
6 provisions of this section unexpended at the end of the
7 period during which it is available for expenditure under
8 the terms of subsection (b) of this section shall lapse.

9 SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions
10 of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218),
11 as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized
12 to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of
13 \$22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and
14 a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957:
15 *Provided*, That the authorization in section 3 of the Federal-
16 Aid Highway Act of 1952 for forest highways for the fiscal
17 year ending June 30, 1955, is hereby canceled; and (2)
18 for forest development roads and trails the sum of \$22,500,-
19 000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like
20 sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957: *Provided*,
21 That with respect to any proposed construction or recon-
22 struction of a timber access road, advisory public hearings
23 shall be held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area
24 of construction or reconstruction with notice and reasonable

1 opportunity for interested persons to present their views
2 as to the practicability and feasibility of such construction
3 or reconstruction: *Provided further*, That hereafter funds
4 available for forest development roads and trails shall also
5 be available for vehicular parking areas: *Provided further*,
6 That the appropriation herein authorized for forest highways
7 shall be apportioned by the Secretary of Commerce for ex-
8 penditure in the several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico in
9 accordance with the provision of section 3 of the Federal-
10 Aid Highway Act of 1950.

11 SEC. 4. (a) For the construction, reconstruction, and
12 improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary
13 bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas ad-
14 ministered by the National Park Service, including areas
15 authorized to be established as national parks and monu-
16 ments, and national park and monument approach roads
17 authorized by the Act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat. 1053),
18 as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated
19 the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,
20 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30,
21 1957.

22 (b) For the construction, reconstruction, and improve-
23 ment of parkways, authorized by Acts of Congress, on lands
24 to which title is vested in the United States, there is hereby

1 authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for
2 the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for
3 the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

4 (c) For the construction, improvement, and mainte-
5 nance of Indian reservation roads and bridges and roads and
6 bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian
7 lands under the provisions of the Act approved May 26,
8 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be
9 appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year
10 ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year
11 ending June 30, 1957: *Provided*, That the location, type,
12 and design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be
13 approved by the Secretary of Commerce before any expendi-
14 tures are made thereon, and all such construction shall be
15 under the general supervision of the Secretary of Commerce.

16 SEC. 5. Any unappropriated balance of the sums hereto-
17 fore authorized to be appropriated by sections 5 and 6 of
18 the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 158), for
19 the Rama Road in Nicaragua and the Inter-American High-
20 way, respectively, for the fiscal years 1953 and 1954, shall
21 continue to be authorized to be appropriated for such purposes
22 for the fiscal years 1955 and 1956.

23 SEC. 6. All provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act
24 of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838) ; the

1 Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, approved June 29, 1948
2 (62 Stat. 1105) ; and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950,
3 approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785) ; and the
4 Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952, approved June 25, 1952
5 (66 Stat. 158) , not inconsistent with this Act, shall remain
6 in full force and effect.

7 SEC. 7. If any section, subsection, or other provision of
8 this Act or the application thereof to any person or circum-
9 stance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act and the
10 application of such section, subsection, or other provision to
11 other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

12 SEC. 8. All Acts or parts of Acts in any way inconsis-
13 ent with the provisions of this Act are hereby repealed, and
14 this Act shall take effect on its passage.

15 SEC. 9. The Secretary of Commerce is hereby directed
16 to make a study in cooperation with the State highway
17 departments and other parties in interest relative to the prob-
18 lems posed by necessary relocation and reconstruction of
19 public utilities services resulting from highway improvements
20 authorized under this Act. Among other things, such a study
21 shall include a review and financial analysis of existing
22 relationships between the State highway departments and
23 affected utilities of all types, and a review of the various
24 State statutes regulating existing relationships, to the end

1 that a full and informative report may be made to the
2 President for transmittal to the Congress of the United States
3 not later than February 1, 1955.

4 SEC. 10. The term "highway", as defined in section 2
5 of the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921 (42 Stat.
6 212), as amended and supplemented, shall be deemed to
7 include "tunnels".

8 SEC. 11. The Secretary of Commerce may approve as
9 a part of the Federal-aid secondary system, extensions
10 through urban areas, connecting points on that system, pro-
11 vided that Federal participation in projects on such exten-
12 sions shall be limited to urban funds.

13 SEC. 12. For the purpose of expediting the interstate
14 planning and coordination of a continuous Great River Road
15 and appurtenances thereto traversing the Mississippi Valley
16 from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico in general conformity
17 with the provisions of the Federal Aid Road Act of July 11,
18 1916, as amended and supplemented, and with the recom-
19 mended plan set forth in the joint report submitted to the
20 Congress November 28, 1951, by the Secretaries of Com-
21 merce and Interior pursuant to the Act of August 24, 1949
22 (Public Law 262, Eighty-first Congress), there is hereby
23 authorized to be expended by the Secretary of Commerce
24 from general administrative funds not to exceed \$250,000;
25 the amount expended under this section shall be apportioned

1 among the ten States bordering the Mississippi River in pro-
2 portion to the amount allocated by these respective States for
3 the improvement and extension of existing sections of this
4 highway project as approved by the Secretary of Commerce
5 in cooperation with other public agencies concerned there-
6 with.

7 SEC. 13. This Act may be cited as the “Federal-Aid
8 Highway Act of 1954”.

Passed the House of Representatives March 8, 1954.

Attest:

LYLE O. SNADER,

Clerk.

AN ACT

To amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

MARCH 9 (legislative day, March 1), 1954

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Public Works

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued March 24, 1954
For actions of March 23, 1954
C3rd-2nd, No. 54

CONTENTS

Animal diseases.....5	Legislative program....3,9	Research.....16
Appropriations.....3,5,16	Loans, farm.....3	Road authorizations.....4
Civil defense.....7	Missouri Basin.....11	Surplus commodities.....14
Dairy industry.....1,10	Pesticide chemicals.....2	Taxation.....9
Education.....13	Price supports.....1,10,15	Trade, foreign.....18
Electrification.....6,17	Public works.....12	Training.....13
Expenditures.....8	Reclamation.....11	Veterans' benefits.....3
Extension work.....16		

HIGHLIGHTS: House committee reported bill to regulate pesticide chemicals. Sen. Humphrey introduced and discussed bill to continue 90% dairy price supports. Rep. Johnson, Wis., spoke against reduction in dairy price supports. Rep. Hagen, Minn., claimed businessmen favor high price supports. Rep. Jenkins recommended distribution of surpluses to needy. House postponed debate on supplemental appropriation bill.

HOUSE

1. PRICE SUPPORTS. Rep. Johnson, Wis., spoke in favor of temporary continuation of 90% dairy supports (p. 3517).
2. PESTICIDE CHEMICALS. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported with amendment H. R. 7125, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to residues of pesticide chemicals in or on raw agricultural commodities (H. Rept. 1385)(p. 3424).
3. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Debate on the third supplemental appropriation bill was postponed until Mar. 25 with the understanding that if a record vote is requested the vote will be deferred until Mar. 29. It was agreed that the VA-loan bill will be considered today, Mar. 24. (pp. 3518-9.)

SENATE

4. ROAD AUTHORIZATIONS. The "Daily Digest" states: "Committee on Public Works... met in executive session to review language in a clean bill to be introduced and reported to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways. As approved by the committee, the bill would authorize...an increase of \$135 million over the House-approved measure..." (p. D312.)
5. ANIMAL DISEASES. Sen. Thye inserted a resolution of the Minnesota Dairy Products and Livestock Commission requesting continuation of Federal indemnities for cattle condemned on account of brucellosis (pp. 3465-6).
6. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Kefauver inserted a newspaper editorial defending TVA's power program (p. 3470).

7. CIVIL DEFENSE. Sen. Wiley recommended an expanded civil-defense program (pp. 3473-4).
8. EXPENDITURES. Sen. Wiley inserted and commended statements favoring economy in Government expenditures (pp. 3476-7).
9. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. H. R. 8224, the excise-tax reduction bill, was made the unfinished business (p. 3514).

BILLS INTRODUCED

10. DAIRY PRICE SUPPORTS. S. 3169, by Sen. Humphrey, to continue temporarily 90% dairy price supports; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 3468). Remarks of author (p. 3468).
11. MISSOURI BASIN. H. R. 8520, by Rep. Miller, Nebr., to provide for construction by Interior of various irrigation units of the Missouri River Basin project; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 3524).
H. R. 8519, by Rep. Mahon, making an appropriation to finance an investigation of the feasibility of developing surplus water in the Missouri River basin for use in Texas; to Appropriations Committee (p. 3524).
12. PUBLIC WORKS. H. R. 8523, by Rep. Sullivan, to offset declining employment by providing for Federal assistance in public works; to Public Works Committee (p. 3525).
13. EDUCATION; TRAINING. H. R. 8526, by Rep. Hagen, Calif., and H. R. 8527, by Rep. Teague, to extend the time for education and training under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952; to Veterans' Affairs Committee (p. 3525).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

14. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. Extension of remarks of Rep. Jenkins favoring distribution of surpluses to the needy (pp. A2220-1).
Sen. Humphrey inserted a newspaper article discussing proposed plans of Minn. dairymen to increase consumption of dairy products (pp. A2199-20).
15. PRICE SUPPORTS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Hagen, Minn., claiming that Minn. businessmen favor 90% supports and including a statement from businessmen opposing flexible supports (pp. A2209-10).
16. EXTENSION WORK; RESEARCH. Rep. Forand inserted a R. I. Assn. of Farmers statement discussing how the increase proposed in the 1955 Federal budget for agricultural research and extension work would be used (pp. A2206-7).
17. ELECTRIFICATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Metcalf discussing conflicting statements on the Administration's power policy, claiming that REA cooperatives are told one thing while power companies are told another (pp. A2207-9).
Rep. LeCompte inserted a newspaper editorial discussing TVA cost and favoring "divorcement of the electric power business from TVA's activities in agriculture, manufacturing and conservation" (p. A2204).
18. TARIFFS. Rep. Bailey inserted an editorial opposing tariff reduction (pp. A2224-5).
Rep. Reed, N. Y., inserted an editorial claiming the Randall Commission's recommendations were criticized by 18 economics experts (p. A2227).

COMMITTEE HEARING ANNOUNCEMENTS FOR MAR. 24: Price supports, H. and S. Agriculture. USDA appropriations for 1955, S. Appropriations.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate rejected, by 36 yeas to 53 nays, resolution on New Mexico senatorial election.

Secondary-boycott prohibition approved by House committee.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 3465-3478

Bills Introduced: Seven bills were introduced, as follows: S. 3163 to S. 3169. Page 3468

Bills Referred: Two House-passed bills were referred to appropriate committees. Page 3469

New Mexico Senatorial Election: By 36 yeas to 53 nays, Senate rejected S. Res. 220, declaring that no person was elected to the Senate from New Mexico in 1952 and that a vacancy exists in the representation of that State in the Senate, after rejecting by 36 yeas to 53 nays, Cordon amendment declaring it to be sense of Senate if the resolution is adopted that the vacancy should be filled only through an election held pursuant to the laws of New Mexico. Pages 3478-3514

Excise Taxes: H. R. 8224, excise tax reduction bill, was made Senate's unfinished business. Page 3514

Nomination: The nomination of Arthur Larson, of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary of Labor, was received. Page 3515

Program for Wednesday: Senate recessed at 5:45 p. m. until noon Wednesday, March 24, when it will consider H. R. 8224, excise tax reduction bill.

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

DROUGHT ASSISTANCE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry: Committee held hearings on the problem of assistance for drought-affected areas, with testimony urging immediate action from Senator Kerr, and the following witnesses, who also urged immediate relief for these areas and proposed payment of \$1 per acre for land practices which would prevent soil blowing: Lail Schmidt, Lamar, Colo.; Murray Giffin, president, and Clifford Hart, vice president, both of Colorado Wheat Growers Association, Holly,

Colo.; J. J. Berg, vice president, Texas Farmers Union, Panhandle, Tex.; Ray Mall, Boise City, Okla.; Merlin Carter, Syracuse, Kans.; and Noel McDade, Clayton, N. Mex.

APPROPRIATIONS—AGRICULTURE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee began hearings on proposed 1955 budget estimates for the Agriculture Department, with a general statement from Secretary of Agriculture Benson, accompanied by Under Secretary True D. Morse, Assistant Secretary J. Earl Coke, and other officials of the department. Hearings continue tomorrow.

APPROPRIATIONS—JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee continued hearings on H. R. 8067, State, Justice, Commerce appropriations for 1955, with testimony in behalf of funds for their respective departments from the following Justice Department officials, accompanied by their associates: S. A. Andretta, Administrative Assistant Attorney General, on funds for his office, for examination of judicial offices, and the Administrative Division; W. E. Burger, Assistant Attorney General, for Civil Division; Paul Tappan, Chairman, Board of Parole; T. G. Finucane, Chairman, Board of Immigration Appeals; S. E. Sobeloff, Solicitor General; H. B. Holland, Assistant Attorney General, for Tax Division; J. Lee Rankin, Assistant Attorney General, for Office of Legal Counsel; P. W. Morton, Assistant Attorney General, for Lands Division; and J. W. Yeagley, First Assistant Attorney General, for Criminal Division. Hearings continue tomorrow.

APPROPRIATIONS—TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee continued hearings on H. R. 7893, Treasury-Post Office appropriations for 1955, with testimony in behalf of funds for the Treasury Department from the following departmental officials: R. W. Maxwell, Bureau of Accounts; Paul D. Banning, Division of Disbursement; E. L. Kilby,

Bureau of the Public Debt; Earl Shreve, Savings Bond Division; Leland Howard, Bureau of the Mint; and A. W. Hall, Bureau of Engraving and Printing. Hearings continue tomorrow.

CLASSIFIED NAVY PROJECT

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Real Estate and Military Construction met in executive session and approved a Navy classified project in Spain.

HOUSING

Committee on Banking and Currency: Committee continued hearings on S. 2938, to aid in the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, and the conservation and development of urban communities, with testimony, as indicated, from the following witnesses:

Charles E. Foster, DAV, who testified against those provisions of the bill which would dilute existing veterans' preferences, and also against the flexible interest rates provision of the bill;

Ralph J. Perk, city councilman, Cleveland, who testified generally in support of the bill, particularly the urban renewal provisions thereof, and also testified as to the need for aid and assistance for air pollution control;

M. K. M. Murphy, U. S. Savings and Loan League, who supported some sections of the bill, including title VI, relating to savings and loan amendments, but also opposed some sections of the bill, particularly those changing the maturity and down-payment terms, the extension of such liberal terms to existing homes, and the provisions of the bill on FNMA, recommending that, in lieu of the latter, the recommendations of the President's Advisory Committee on Housing be accepted; the witness also questioned the soundness of the FHA mutual reserve fund; and

R. G. Hughes, National Association of Home Builders, who generally supported the legislation, but offered a number of specific amendments to the bill.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

INVESTIGATIONS

Committee on Government Operations: Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations met in executive session with regard to the investigation of the controversy that has arisen from charges of misconduct against members of its staff, and countercharges of misconduct made against certain individuals in the Department of the Army. Following this meeting, it was announced (1) that Senator Jackson had been added to the special subcommittee to select a special counsel to conduct the investigation, but that no such counsel has, as yet, been selected, (2) that another special subcommittee on "ground rules," consisting of Senators Dirksen, chairman, Potter, and Symington, had been selected to help draft rules of procedure for these hearings, and (3) that the forthcoming hearings may be televised. Subcommittee recessed subject to call.

CARGO LOADING

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Subcommittee on Water Transportation held hearings on S. 602, regarding rules for loading, stowage, and securing of grain and other similar bulk cargoes, and heard testimony favoring enactment of the bill from Rear Adm. Halbert C. Sheppard, U. S. Coast Guard. Also testifying were R. H. Wetmore, secretary, Pacific Coast Conference of Marine Surveyors, accompanied by David Dunlap, attorney, who generally favored the bill but opposed the provision in section 4 which would permit the Secretary of the Treasury to avail himself of the services of any "private nonprofit organization." Hearings continue tomorrow.

HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

Committee on Public Works: Committee met in executive session to review language in a clean bill to be introduced and reported to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways. As approved by the committee, the bill would authorize \$1,010 million, an increase of \$135 million over the House-approved measure of \$875 million.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 13 public bills, H. R. 8513-8523, and H. R. 8526 and 8527; 2 private bills, H. R. 8524 and 8525; and 2 resolutions, H. J. Res. 479 and H. Con. Res. 220, were introduced.

Pages 3524-3525

Bills Reported: Reports were filed as follows:

H. R. 4496, a private bill;

H. R. 6876, amending the act of February 13, 1900 (31 Stat. 28), relating to railway installations on the batture

in front of the Public Health Service hospital property in New Orleans, La., amended (H. Rept. 1382);

H. R. 6374, to revise certain laws relating to warrant officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, amended (H. Rept. 1383); and

H. R. 7125, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to residues of pesticide chemicals in or on raw agricultural commodities. (H. Rept. 1385).

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued March 26, 1954
For actions of March 25, 1954
83rd-2nd, No. 56

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....6,12	Forestry.....8	Roads.....8
Appropriations.....1,6,8,20	Fur farming.....7	Statehood.....9,29
Commodity exchanges.....5	Hawaii-Alaska.....9,29	St. Lawrence Seaway.....26
Crop insurance.....4	Health.....23	Sugar Agreement.....11
Dairy industry.....2,10,13	Information.....27	Surplus commodities.....28
Electrification.....25	Loans, farm.....15,24	Taxation.....7,21
Farm program.....19	Patents.....3	TVA.....25
Food, distribution.....28	Personnel.....16	Twine.....14
Foreign aid.....1	Plants.....3	Vehicles.....18
Foreign trade.....14,22	Price supports..2,10,13,17	Veterans benefits.....15

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed 3rd supplemental appropriation bill. House members discussed dairy price supports. Senate committee reported road authorizations bill, and it was discussed. Senate passed excise-tax reduction bill. Senate subcommittee voted to report International Sugar Agreement. Sens. Humphrey and Kefauver recommended continuation of present dairy price supports.

HOUSE

1. THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954. Passed with amendments this bill, H. R. 8481 (pp. 3594-621). For items relating to this Department, see Digest 52. There were no amendments relating to these items. Rep. Andersen explained the items (pp. 3603-4). Rep. Cooley criticized FCA donation of Christmas food packages (pp. 3606-10).
2. DAIRY PRICE SUPPORTS. Reps. Johnson of Wis., Whitten, Pfof, and Blatnik spoke against reduction of dairy price supports, and Rep. Javits spoke in favor of such reduction (pp. 3591-4).
3. PLANT PATENTING. The Judiciary Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) H. R. 5420, to amend the law relating to patenting of plants (p. D328).
4. CROP INSURANCE. Received from this Department a proposed bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to provide for payment from premium income for costs of adjusters and commissions for sales and servicing of new contracts; to Agriculture Committee (p. 3624).
5. COMMODITY EXCHANGES. Received from this Department a proposed bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act so as to authorize the Secretary to fix reasonable fees and charges for registrations and renewals and for copies of registration certificates; to Agriculture Committee (p. 3624). Also received in Senate; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 3627).

6. ADJOURNED until Mon., Mar. 29 (p. 3624). The independent offices appropriation bill is to be debated Mon. and Tues., followed by various bills not concerning agriculture (p. 3621).

SENATE

7. TAXATION. Passed, 76-8, with amendments H. R. 8224, to reduce certain excise taxes, and Senate conferees were appointed (pp. 3632, 3646-85). Sen. Johnson, Colo., inserted statements on the importance of fur farming (pp. 3678-9).
8. ROAD AUTHORIZATIONS. The Public Works Committee reported without amendment S. 3184, to authorize road appropriations for the fiscal years 1956 and 1957 (S. Rept. 1093), and Sen. Martin and others discussed the bill (pp. 3632-3). The Senate Committee increased "Forest highways" and "Forest roads and trails" by \$2,500,000 each for each of the fiscal years. (The present law and the House bill authorize annual appropriations of \$22,500,000 for each of these items.)
9. STATEHOOD. S. 49, the Hawaii-Alaska statehood bill, was again made the unfinished business, and Sen. Knowland said it was intended to continue with this bill until it is disposed of except for possible conference reports, etc. (pp. 3687-8).
10. DAIRY PRICE SUPPORTS. Sen. Humphrey urged passage of S. 3169, his bill to provide a 4-month extension of 90% dairy supports "until the committees complete action on new farm legislation" (pp. 3629-30).
Sens. Kefauver and Humphrey criticized the reduction in dairy price supports, and Sen. Kefauver claimed that Tenn. milk producers would receive 1/3 less income in 1954 than they did in 1952 and favored congressional action to continue present supports "until the question can be further studied" (pp. 3638-44).
11. SUGAR AGREEMENT. The subcommittee ordered reported to the Foreign Relations Committee the International Sugar Agreement (Exec. B, 83rd Cong., 2d sess.) (p. D327).
12. RECESSED until Mon., Mar. 29 (p. 3689).

BILLS INTRODUCED

13. PRICE SUPPORTS. H. R. 8558, by Rep. Pfost, to continue temporarily existing 90% of parity price supports for milk and butterfat; to Agriculture Committee (p. 3625).
H. R. 8560, by Rep. Bow, to limit the reduction in dairy supports; to Agriculture Committee (p. 3625). Remarks of author (pp. A2281-2).
14. TWINE STATISTICS. H. R. 8562, by Rep. Gross, to authorize the Census Bureau to collect and publish statistics on twine imports; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 3625).
15. FARM LOANS. H. R. 8574, by Rep. Donohue, to reduce from 4½% to 4% the interest rate on loans under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act; to Veterans' Affairs Committee (p. 3625).
16. PERSONNEL. H. R. 8578, by Rep. Yorty, to increase the pay of Government employees; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 3625).
17. PRICE SUPPORTS. H. R. 8575, by Rep. Poage, "with respect to price supports for basic commodities"; to Agriculture Committee (p. 3625).

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1954

MARCH 25 (legislative day, MARCH 1), 1954.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. CASE, from the Committee on Public Works, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. 3184]

The Committee on Public Works, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3184) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The Subcommittee on Public Roads held hearings on proposed Federal-aid highway legislation on February 19 and 26, and March 1, 3, 4, and 11, 1954. The bills dealing with general highway legislation which were under consideration by the committee are listed as follows:

S. 2859, introduced by Senator Francis Case, which proposed a total of \$1,002 million for each of the fiscal years 1956 and 1957.

S. 2982, introduced by Senator Edward Martin, by request, which would authorize a total of \$887 million per year.

H. R. 8127, a companion bill to S. 2982, with substantially the same provisions.

S. 3069, introduced by Senator Homer Ferguson, which would authorize a total of \$2,208 million per year.

S. 216, introduced by Senators Warren B. Magnuson and Harley M. Kilgore, which called for amounts equivalent to the collection of automotive taxes during the preceding calendar year.

After considering these bills and the testimony given at the hearings, the committee has adopted and written the legislation in S. 3184 which has been introduced as a substitute for the above-mentioned bills.

The last Federal-aid highway act was passed in 1952. The authorizations contained in that act for the Federal-aid systems have all

been apportioned. Additional authorizations should be provided at this time in order that the States may program their financing arrangements to match the Federal funds. In most States, this requires appropriate action by the State legislatures, many of which meet in biennial sessions.

Almost without exception witnesses at the hearings recommended larger authorizations than those provided in the 1952 act. The testimony shows that the number of vehicles on the highways and the mileage traveled have maintained the steady upward trend which began shortly after the cessation of hostilities in 1945. In 1946 there were 34,400,000 motor vehicles on our roads. Today there are about 55 million. Highway improvement has been progressing during the same period at a much slower pace. The gap between highway usage and improvement needs has widened. Estimates made during the past year show that 63.8 percent of the mileage on the Federal-aid systems is in need of improvement, at a total cost of about \$35 billion. Two years ago, the cost of these needed improvements was estimated at \$32 billion. If we are to close this gap, highway improvement must be speeded up, and this means increased expenditures for such purposes. It is fully recognized that an adequate highway transportation system is vital to the Nation's economy. The committee feels that the Federal contributions to this system should be gaged with the objective of bringing highway improvements up to the level of needs as soon as practicable.

AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FEDERAL-AID SYSTEMS

The bill continues the Federal-aid highway program for an additional 2-year period under substantially the same basic pattern as heretofore adopted by Congress. The amounts recommended for these systems for each of the fiscal years 1956 and 1957 are listed in the following table, together with comparable figures for the current authorizations and for the House bill, H. R. 8127.

Federal-aid systems

	Present law	H. R. 8127	S. 3184
Primary (45 percent).....	\$247, 500, 000	\$270, 000, 000	\$342, 000, 000
Secondary (30 percent).....	165, 000, 000	180, 000, 000	228, 000, 000
Urban (25 percent).....	137, 500, 000	150, 000, 000	190, 000, 000
Subtotal.....	550, 000, 000	600, 000, 000	760, 000, 000
Interstate.....	25, 000, 000	200, 000, 000	150, 000, 000
Total.....	575, 000, 000	800, 000, 000	910, 000, 000

The committee believes that the total recommended, \$910 million per year, together with the much greater sums that will be spent by State and local governments, constitutes a realistic step toward meeting the \$35 billion deficiency in highway improvements. In setting this figure, the committee was aware that Federal revenues from excise taxes imposed on highway users are now reaching a level of a little over \$2 billion a year, of which about \$1 billion comes from the Federal tax on gasoline, diesel fuel, and motor oil. While it is recognized that these taxes were originally adopted as a temporary measure to provide general revenues and were later extended largely

to meet the burdens of defense expenditures, the committee feels that their continuation certainly adds to the justification for the larger amounts of Federal aid recommended at this time.

It may be noted that the distribution of funds for the Federal-aid system differs somewhat from that proposed in the House bill, H. R. 8127. The distribution of the primary, secondary, and urban funds is in the same traditional ratio established in 1944, but the House bill allocates \$200 million, or one-quarter of the total, to the separate interstate fund. The Senate bill allocates \$150 million to the interstate funds, but adds \$160 million more to the primary, secondary, and urban funds. The relationship among those 4 categories of funds should be borne in mind in comparing the allocations in the 2 bills. There are actually only two physically separate Federal-aid highway systems, the primary and the secondary. The other two categories, to which the urban and interstate funds are allocated, are component parts of the primary system. The main through roads and interstate roads constitute the primary system. The secondary system consists of farm-to-market, county, and local roads which feed the local traffic into the primary roads. The urban category is simply those portions of roads on the primary system which are located in urban areas. The interstate category is a select network of primary roads chosen so as to connect the principal metropolitan areas, cities, and industries, and to serve national defense. It is in effect a network of the most important arteries of interstate highway transportation carved out of the primary system and including urban links which are also in the urban category. It is therefore eligible to receive both primary and urban funds as well as funds from the interstate category.

The mileage of the secondary system is about 460,000 miles. The primary system has a total of about 234,700 miles, of which 17,900 miles are in the urban category and 37,800 miles are in the interstate category.

The primary system has three sources of Federal-aid funds, from the primary, urban, and interstate categories. The secondary system has only a single source since no subdivisions of that system have ever been established.

The House bill increased the Federal-aid total funds by 39 percent over the current authorizations. It increased the interstate category 800 percent but increased the primary, secondary, and urban categories only 9 percent. This results in holding the secondary system to a 9 percent increase while the 3 categories making up the primary system gain an average increase of 51 percent. The committee realizes that highways on the interstate network must be built to relatively high standards with consequent higher costs than most other Federal-aid highways. It also appreciates the relative national importance of this network. It feels that this disparity in the division between the primary and secondary systems should be reduced at least partially, and accordingly has recommended a division which would result in an increase of 38 percent over existing authorizations for the secondary system and an average increase of 66 percent for the 3 subdivisions of the primary systems. Even though this partially improves the sharing of the secondary system in the total increase, it still gives the interstate category a very substantial increase of 600 percent over the current authorization. It may be noted further that the cost of needed improvements for the Federal-aid systems totaling

\$35 billion is made up of \$9.07 billion for the secondary system and \$25.93 billion for the 3 categories in the primary system. In terms of percentage, the secondary system represents 26 percent of the total needed improvements, and the primary system 74 percent. In the Senate bill, the secondary system would receive 25 percent of the Federal-aid funds, and the primary system 75 percent. In the House bill, the secondary system would be cut to 22½ percent of the Federal-aid funds, with the primary system receiving 77½ percent. The comparisons discussed above are shown below in tabular form.

Percentage comparison of House and Senate bills

	House bill— Percentage increase over present law	Senate bill— Percentage increase over present law
Primary system:		
Primary.....	9	38
Urban.....	9	38
Interstate.....	800	600
Average for primary system.....	51	66
Secondary system.....	9	38
Average for all Federal-aid.....	39	58

Comparison of allocations with cost of improvements

Federal-aid systems	Cost of needed improvements (billions)	Percent of total cost	Percent of allocations in House bill	Percent of allocations in Senate bill
Primary.....	\$25.93	74	77.5	75
Secondary.....	9.07	26	22.5	25
Total.....	35.00	100	100.0	100

The funds for the primary, secondary, and urban designations will be apportioned among, and matched by, the States on the same basis as provided under existing law. The apportionment and matching of the interstate funds are discussed in a succeeding paragraph. The approximate amounts which each State would receive for the Federal-aid systems, and a comparison by States of the total amounts under the Senate and House bills are shown in the following tables:

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1954

State	Federal aid				Interstate		Total
	Primary	Secondary	Urban	Subtotal	Population ¹	Sec. 21 ²	
Total	\$342,000,000	\$228,000,000	\$190,000,000	\$760,000,000	\$75,000,000	\$75,000,000	\$910,000,000
Alabama	7,298,000	5,655,000	2,454,000	15,407,000	1,407,000	1,615,000	18,430,000
Arizona	5,115,000	3,383,000	729,000	9,327,000	552,000	1,130,000	11,009,000
Arkansas	5,693,000	4,537,000	1,018,000	11,298,000	877,000	1,260,000	13,435,000
California	16,698,000	8,083,000	16,654,000	40,435,000	4,865,000	3,485,000	48,788,000
Colorado	6,154,000	4,110,000	1,557,000	11,821,000	609,000	1,361,000	13,791,000
Connecticut	2,217,000	1,117,000	3,628,000	6,962,000	922,000	1,416,000	8,378,000
Delaware	1,676,000	1,117,000	3,381,000	3,177,000	552,000	368,000	4,097,000
Florida	5,556,000	3,632,000	3,359,000	12,547,000	1,273,000	1,232,000	15,052,000
Georgia	8,464,000	6,464,000	2,730,000	17,658,000	1,583,000	1,874,000	21,115,000
Idaho	4,215,000	2,965,000	361,000	7,541,000	552,000	932,000	9,025,000
Illinois	13,175,000	7,175,000	13,102,000	33,452,000	4,004,000	2,926,000	40,382,000
Indiana	8,118,000	5,896,000	4,482,000	18,196,000	1,808,000	1,799,000	21,803,000
Iowa	8,259,000	6,044,000	2,224,000	16,527,000	1,204,000	1,031,000	19,558,000
Kansas	8,300,000	5,811,000	1,761,000	15,872,000	1,875,000	1,831,000	18,581,000
Kentucky	6,304,000	3,233,000	1,946,000	13,483,000	1,353,000	1,397,000	16,235,000
Louisiana	5,329,000	3,857,000	2,746,000	11,932,000	1,233,000	1,182,000	14,347,000
Maine	2,869,000	2,053,000	783,000	5,705,000	552,000	635,000	6,892,000
Maryland	3,006,000	1,838,000	3,180,000	8,024,000	1,076,000	668,000	9,768,000
Massachusetts	4,344,000	1,613,000	7,798,000	13,755,000	2,156,000	970,000	16,881,000
Michigan	10,614,000	6,476,000	8,720,000	25,810,000	2,928,000	2,355,000	31,093,000
Minnesota	8,803,000	6,261,000	3,021,000	18,131,000	1,370,000	1,963,000	21,514,000
Mississippi	6,114,000	5,093,000	1,037,000	12,244,000	1,001,000	1,353,000	14,598,000
Missouri	9,968,000	6,745,000	4,614,000	21,327,000	1,817,000	2,207,000	25,351,000
Montana	6,868,000	4,725,000	1,441,000	12,034,000	552,000	1,517,000	14,103,000
Nebraska	6,668,000	4,728,000	1,099,000	12,495,000	609,000	1,474,000	14,578,000
Nevada	4,416,000	2,951,000	1,143,000	7,510,000	552,000	975,000	9,037,000
New Hampshire	1,676,000	1,117,000	555,000	3,348,000	552,000	368,000	4,268,000
New Jersey	4,422,000	1,488,000	8,201,000	14,111,000	2,222,000	987,000	17,320,000
New Mexico	5,560,000	3,819,000	615,000	9,994,000	552,000	1,228,000	11,774,000
New York	16,075,000	6,442,000	25,041,000	47,558,000	6,815,000	3,581,000	57,954,000
North Carolina	8,474,000	7,239,000	2,407,000	18,120,000	1,866,000	1,878,000	21,864,000
North Dakota	4,961,000	3,603,000	317,000	8,881,000	1,552,000	1,096,000	10,529,000
Ohio	11,925,000	7,254,000	10,841,000	30,020,000	3,652,000	2,648,000	36,320,000
Oklahoma	7,318,000	5,240,000	2,047,000	14,605,000	1,026,000	1,619,000	17,250,000
Oregon	5,846,000	4,086,000	1,494,000	11,434,000	699,000	1,294,000	13,427,000
Pennsylvania	13,422,000	7,988,000	14,183,000	35,593,000	4,824,000	2,985,000	43,402,000
Rhode Island	1,676,000	1,117,000	1,339,000	4,132,000	552,000	368,000	5,052,000
South Carolina	4,605,000	3,813,000	1,289,000	9,707,000	973,000	1,993,000	11,700,000
South Dakota	5,341,000	3,813,000	1,364,000	9,520,000	552,000	1,180,000	11,252,000

See footnotes at end of table, p. 6.

Comparison by States, total apportionment in Senate and House bills

State	Senate bill (S. 3184)	House bill (H. R. 8127)	State	Senate bill (S. 3184)	House bill (H. R. 8127)
Total.....	\$910,000,000	\$800,000,000	Nevada.....	\$9,037,000	\$7,964,000
Alabama.....	18,430,000	16,195,000	New Hampshire.....	4,268,000	3,868,000
Arizona.....	11,009,000	9,605,000	New Jersey.....	17,320,000	15,420,000
Arkansas.....	13,435,000	11,769,000	New Mexico.....	11,774,000	10,262,000
California.....	48,788,000	43,061,000	New York.....	57,954,000	51,408,000
Colorado.....	13,791,000	11,958,000	North Carolina.....	21,864,000	19,299,000
Connecticut.....	8,378,000	7,385,000	North Dakota.....	10,529,000	9,207,000
Delaware.....	4,097,000	3,733,000	Ohio.....	36,320,000	32,101,000
Florida.....	15,052,000	13,246,000	Oklahoma.....	17,250,000	15,059,000
Georgia.....	21,115,000	18,551,000	Oregon.....	13,427,000	11,685,000
Idaho.....	9,025,000	7,931,000	Pennsylvania.....	43,402,000	38,513,000
Illinois.....	40,382,000	35,649,000	Rhode Island.....	5,052,000	4,487,000
Indiana.....	21,833,000	19,175,000	South Carolina.....	11,700,000	10,320,000
Iowa.....	19,558,000	17,030,000	South Dakota.....	11,252,000	9,824,000
Kansas.....	18,581,000	16,143,000	Tennessee.....	19,050,000	16,756,000
Kentucky.....	16,233,000	14,311,000	Texas.....	54,469,000	47,599,000
Louisiana.....	14,347,000	12,640,000	Utah.....	8,749,000	7,678,000
Maine.....	6,892,000	6,086,000	Vermont.....	4,005,000	3,660,000
Maryland.....	9,768,000	8,663,000	Virginia.....	17,431,000	15,374,000
Massachusetts.....	16,881,000	15,025,000	Washington.....	14,602,000	12,805,000
Michigan.....	31,093,000	27,421,000	West Virginia.....	9,473,000	8,802,000
Minnesota.....	21,514,000	18,798,000	Wisconsin.....	20,753,000	18,215,000
Mississippi.....	14,598,000	12,805,000	Wyoming.....	8,853,000	7,801,000
Missouri.....	25,351,000	22,204,000	Hawaii.....	3,423,000	2,702,000
Montana.....	14,103,000	12,259,000	District of Columbia.....	5,331,000	4,708,000
Nebraska.....	14,578,000	12,642,000	Puerto Rico.....	5,240,000	4,138,000

For purposes of comparison, the apportionment under the 1952 act was as follows:

State or Territory	Primary highway system	Secondary or feeder roads	Urban highways	Interstate system	Total
Total.....	\$247,500,000	\$165,000,000	\$137,500,000	\$25,000,000	\$575,000,000
Alabama.....	5,217,552	4,043,898	1,758,127	532,314	11,551,891
Arizona.....	3,653,303	2,487,990	521,973	371,953	7,035,219
Arkansas.....	4,064,364	3,254,652	750,706	414,318	8,484,040
California.....	11,273,990	5,808,764	11,929,002	1,154,002	30,165,758
Colorado.....	4,402,054	2,940,172	1,115,307	448,362	8,905,895
Connecticut.....	1,571,238	800,250	2,598,965	161,200	5,131,653
Delaware.....	1,200,375	800,250	275,217	121,250	2,397,092
Florida.....	3,903,613	2,550,784	2,406,316	398,804	9,259,517
Georgia.....	6,059,367	4,627,705	1,955,727	618,094	13,260,893
Idaho.....	3,033,324	2,132,917	258,267	308,736	5,733,244
Illinois.....	9,415,818	5,124,593	9,384,933	963,234	24,888,578
Indiana.....	5,833,702	4,020,466	3,210,481	595,500	13,660,089
Iowa.....	5,915,625	4,328,851	1,593,160	602,769	12,440,405
Kansas.....	5,950,738	4,165,742	1,261,297	605,853	11,983,630
Kentucky.....	4,496,820	3,736,080	1,393,596	459,028	10,085,524
Louisiana.....	3,812,021	2,759,226	1,967,149	389,375	8,927,771
Maine.....	2,061,148	1,474,586	560,854	210,101	4,306,689
Maryland.....	2,151,491	1,314,877	2,277,541	220,394	5,964,303
Massachusetts.....	3,102,505	1,149,426	5,585,538	318,932	10,156,401
Michigan.....	7,594,942	4,633,662	6,245,790	776,456	19,250,850
Minnesota.....	6,444,508	4,545,371	2,185,224	656,907	13,832,010
Mississippi.....	4,357,237	3,632,971	742,978	444,235	9,177,421
Missouri.....	7,127,588	4,822,289	3,304,889	726,976	15,981,742
Montana.....	4,957,442	3,409,119	315,997	504,310	9,186,868
Nebraska.....	4,751,285	3,369,779	787,065	483,631	9,391,760
Nevada.....	3,174,465	2,121,392	102,203	322,835	5,720,895
New Hampshire.....	1,200,375	800,250	397,419	121,250	2,519,294
New Jersey.....	3,175,262	1,071,050	5,874,465	326,438	10,447,215
New Mexico.....	4,003,539	2,749,711	440,412	407,468	7,601,130
New York.....	11,527,309	4,622,354	17,937,120	1,182,803	35,269,586
North Carolina.....	6,048,757	5,170,669	1,724,427	617,527	13,561,380
North Dakota.....	3,562,057	2,585,761	226,915	362,325	6,737,058
Ohio.....	8,609,919	5,240,955	7,765,686	850,712	22,497,272
Oklahoma.....	5,245,994	3,755,923	1,466,130	534,576	11,002,623
Oregon.....	4,198,212	2,933,480	1,076,050	427,813	8,635,555
Pennsylvania.....	9,582,120	5,699,723	10,159,251	981,618	26,422,712
Rhode Island.....	1,200,375	800,250	959,321	121,250	3,081,196
South Carolina.....	3,291,443	2,726,238	923,122	335,960	7,276,763
South Dakota.....	3,827,991	2,733,672	260,648	389,370	7,211,681

State or Territory	Primary highway system	Secondary or feeder roads	Urban highways	Interstate system	Total
Tennessee.....	\$5,293,910	\$4,127,446	\$1,940,548	\$540,208	\$11,902,112
Texas.....	15,842,002	10,607,168	6,428,891	1,615,515	34,493,576
Utah.....	2,824,094	1,868,149	568,628	287,607	5,548,478
Vermont.....	1,200,375	800,250	208,950	121,250	2,330,825
Virginia.....	4,645,445	3,611,080	2,092,640	474,439	10,823,604
Washington.....	4,064,587	2,715,106	2,024,855	414,845	9,219,393
West Virginia.....	2,678,927	2,330,488	873,369	273,683	6,156,467
Wisconsin.....	5,802,073	4,047,423	2,627,837	591,968	13,069,301
Wyoming.....	3,053,021	2,068,920	145,912	310,556	5,578,409
District of Columbia.....	1,200,375	800,250	1,159,334	121,250	3,281,209
Hawaii.....	1,200,375	800,250	451,260	-----	2,451,885
Puerto Rico.....	1,269,948	1,327,682	1,153,508	-----	3,751,138

NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS

This is a system designated in accordance with section 7 of the 1944 Federal-Aid Highway Act consisting of not to exceed 40,000 miles of roads selected so as to connect principal metropolitan areas, cities, and industries, and to serve national defense. Prior to the 1952 Highway Act, no funds had been earmarked or authorized exclusively for this network. An authorization of \$25 million was included in the 1952 act. This bill increases the amount to \$150 million in recognition of the network's value as the backbone of the interstate transportation system, its high degree of national importance, and its greater cost due to higher standards required by intensity of use.

As explained in preceding paragraphs, this network is a part of the primary system and is eligible to receive Federal aid from both primary and urban funds. In recent years as much as 34 percent of primary funds and 46 percent of urban funds have been used on the interstate network. Even with this large increase in the interstate fund, it is probable that a substantial portion of the primary and urban funds will continue to be used on the interstate network because the deficiencies are more serious than on many of the other primary and urban roads.

In further recognition of this network's greater importance, cost, and national interest, the committee has provided for a matching ratio of 60 percent Federal and 40 percent State, plus the usual adjustment for States having nontaxable Federal lands.

The House bill contains a provision that the interstate funds cannot be apportioned unless a Federal excise tax on gasoline at the rate of not less than 2 cents per gallon is in effect 9 months prior to the final year for which the funds would be authorized. The committee feels that highway improvement is so vital to the national economy that it should not be made contingent upon the retention of any particular element of the Federal tax structure. Since the gasoline tax was never dedicated to Federal highway expenditures, this proposal would seem to be no more logical than to make the authorizations for many other expenditures contingent upon other specific Federal taxes. In any event, an approach of this type, which might be construed as an indirect dedication of tax revenues, should be considered by the appropriate committees of the Congress in conjunction with their consideration of the Federal tax structure. This committee has therefore omitted that provision from this bill.

TRANSFER OF FUNDS BETWEEN SYSTEMS

The House bill included a provision which would permit the transfer of not to exceed 25 percent of the amount apportioned to any State in any year from any of the 3 systems—primary, secondary, and urban—to either of the others, with the limitation that the total of any such transfers shall not increase the original apportionment under any of the 3 systems by more than 25 percent. The purpose of the provision was stated to be in the interest of flexibility.

It has been noted, however, that if this transfer authority were exercised to the maximum of its limitation, any one of the systems could be reduced 50 percent while the other two would be increased 25 percent each. The following table shows what this would do to the basic division among the three systems which was established by Congress in 1944.

[Percent]

System	Basic division under existing law	Resulting division if 50 percent is transferred away from—		
		Primary	Secondary	Urban
Primary.....	45	22.50	52.5	51.25
Secondary.....	30	41.25	15.0	36.25
Urban.....	25	36.25	32.5	12.50

It is recognized that some degree of flexibility may be useful in the application of funds to be distributed among various public works projects. It was brought to the attention of the committee that the division among the systems was a very difficult matter to resolve with reasonable equity to the interests of all the States when it was raised in 1944. After serious, extensive study of the problem, it was resolved and accepted by adoption in the Highway Act of 1944. That act also included certain provisions which would allow some degree of flexibility in that secondary funds could be used on the other systems under certain conditions. These provisions and the names of the States which have made use of them are as follows:

Section 3 (b) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 reads in part as follows:

Provided further, That any of such funds for secondary and feeder roads which are apportioned to a State in which all public roads and highways are under the control and supervision of the State highway department may, if the State highway department and the Commissioner of Public Roads jointly agree that such funds are not needed for secondary and feeder roads, be expended for projects in such State on the Federal-aid highway system.

The following States qualify under this provision: Delaware, North Carolina, West Virginia, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico.

Transfers have been approved in the following States: Delaware, District of Columbia, North Carolina.

Section 3 (b) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 which authorized funds for projects on the secondary road system reads in part as follows:

* * * *Provided further*, That in any State having a population density of more than two hundred per square mile, as shown by the latest available Federal census, the said system may be selected by the State highway department with the approval of the Commissioner of Public Roads without regard to included municipal boundaries: * * *

The following is a list of States which have population densities of 200 or more per square mile according to the 1950 census: Connecticut, District of Columbia, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico. All of the above States have applied secondary funds to improvements inside urban areas.

It may be noted that any State could transfer secondary funds to the primary, urban, and interstate categories of the primary system under the provisions of existing law if the State should pass legislation placing all of its public roads and highways under the control and supervision of the State highway department. In view of the foregoing, and recognizing further that the large increase of interstate funds recommended in the bill provides a greater source and flexibility in the application of funds for the primary, urban, and interstate categories, the committee believes that the 25 percent transfer provision should be passed over at least until a more convincing case can be made for its adoption. If any serious fault exists in the basic division which has been adhered to since its adoption in 1944, the facts should be developed and presented in full, and any changes found advisable should be proposed for direct consideration rather than by indirection.

SECONDARY ROADS

The House bill includes a provision with respect to secondary roads which permits the Secretary of Commerce to discharge his responsibility relative to plans, design, inspection, and construction of secondary road projects by his receiving and approving a certified statement by the State highway department setting forth that the plans, design, and construction for such projects are in accord with the State standards and procedures applicable to projects in this category approved by him. The purpose is to allow the Secretary to reduce some of the present administrative procedures and pass on to the States more of the responsibility and latitude in administering the secondary road program. The committee concurs generally in this purpose but has modified the House language so as to insure that it will continue the provisions of section 1 (b) of the 1950 act which require that the secondary road projects shall be selected and the specifications with respect thereto shall be determined by the State highway department and the appropriate local officials in cooperation with each other. It was also modified to insure that the provisions of existing law regarding maintenance will continue to be applicable.

FEDERALLY BUILT ROADS ON OR TO FEDERALLY OWNED OR CONTROLLED LANDS

The testimony shows that a large backlog also exists in the roads on federally owned or controlled lands. The responsibility for improving and maintaining these roads lies wholly with the Federal Government. Some of these, such as the forest highways, are portions of through-state or interstate highways, and Federal funds must be provided so that these federally owned links can be kept up in a condition comparable to the adjoining State-owned Federal-aid roads.

The forest roads and trails must be improved to permit economical marketing of timber on a sustained-yield basis. According to the

testimony, the financial loss to the Federal Government through inability to market mature timber was about \$20 million in gross revenue in the fiscal year 1953. Likewise, the park roads and trails are deteriorating seriously because of a greatly increased volume of visitors, coupled with insufficient funds for adequate improvement and maintenance. Similar deficiencies were noted with respect to the Indian roads, parkways, and public-land roads. Typical of the public-lands roads on which much work remains to be done are those portions of routes U. S. 59 and 271 which lie in the Ouachita National Forest in Oklahoma.

The committee has increased the authorizations for most of these roads a slight amount over the current level. In order to encourage a speedier reduction of the existing backlog, the committee feels that these roads should be treated in the same manner as the Federal-aid systems. It has included language providing for the use of contract authorizations with the same 2-year extension of availability and lapsing provisions which apply to the Federal-aid systems. It is expected that this will result in better progress consistent with the objective upon which this bill is based, for bringing our entire national highway transportation system up to standards needed to meet the traffic demands.

A comparison of the amounts relating to this class of roads as provided in existing law, in the House bill, and in the Senate bill is shown in the following table:

	Present law	House bill	Senate bill
Forest highways.....	\$22, 500, 000	\$22, 500, 000	\$25, 000, 000
Forest roads and trails.....	22, 500, 000	22, 500, 000	25, 000, 000
Park roads and trails.....	10, 000, 000	10, 000, 000	12, 500, 000
Parkways.....	10, 000, 000	10, 000, 000	12, 500, 000
Indian roads.....	10, 000, 000	10, 000, 000	12, 500, 000
Public lands.....	2, 500, 000		2, 500, 000
Total.....	77, 500, 000	75, 000, 000	90, 000, 000

INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY AND RAMA ROAD

The Inter-American Highway is a continuous route extending from Panama northward through all but one of the Central American countries and connecting with interstate routes in the United States. About 1,500 miles in Mexico has been built entirely with Mexican funds. Congress enacted legislation in 1941 providing for participation by the United States largely because of its defense value at that time and other benefits that could be anticipated from the opening of this area to the interchange of commerce over a through transportation artery. Existing law provides for an authorization of \$8 million per year for each of the fiscal years 1953 and 1954. As these amounts have not been fully used, the House bill did not include any amounts for succeeding years. The committee believes that appropriate amounts should be included at this time as continued evidence of good faith in the development of this important highway which will produce stronger commercial relations with the good neighbors to the south of our border. Accordingly, it has approved further authorizations in the amount of \$8 million per year for the next 5 years, which is estimated to be sufficient for completion of the participation of the United States in the highway.

The committee likewise has approved an amount of \$2 million per year for the next 2 years for the Rama Road, which will be sufficient to finish the road and will complete the diplomatic obligation entered into several years ago with Nicaragua.

RESEARCH

The committee has approved language which would clarify and broaden the existing authorizations for highway research by spelling out several of the principal subjects on which research may be undertaken. This is considered advisable so that any possible concern over the sufficiency of existing law will not serve to retard the excellent work that is now being done and remains to be done in this field. The committee received requests for an increase in amounts previously provided for safety studies. It may be noted that safety is one of the research subjects spelled out in the new language. This will serve to remove previous specific limitations on safety studies and will allow them to be expanded within the overall limitation for administrative expenses to which all research costs are chargeable. The committee's attention was also called to growing concern over the lack of uniformity in weight and size standards for vehicles using the public highways. It has provided for including in the research program further studies on this subject and on the feasibility of uniformity in State regulations relating thereto. The Secretary will be expected to report to the committees of Congress from time to time on the progress and findings on these matters.

UTILITY RELOCATIONS

The committee heard considerable testimony from owners and operators of various public utilities concerning the heavy financial burden placed upon them when reconstruction or modernization of highways requires that their facilities be moved from their prior locations on the highway right-of-way. It was stated that in some instances the relocation expense represented such a large proportion of their total capital investment that they would be forced out of business, thereby depriving large numbers of customers from needed services. In other cases it was stated that they would have to make large increases in the rates charged to their customers.

In most instances, these utilities are occupying the public highway rights-of-way by sufferance, and it appears that they receive some advantage because of the convenience of the existence of the highway as a means of access for maintaining and servicing their facilities. The utilities are now seeking legislation in the Federal-Aid Act which would require that they be reimbursed for relocation of their facilities, either wholly or in part from Federal funds.

The data presented at the hearings seem to show that some inequity does exist in the assessment of utility relocation costs under present conditions. The testimony does not indicate, however, what, if any, responsibility might be attributed to the Federal Government for this situation. On the contrary, it appears that such inequities as may exist arise largely because of the relationships between the utilities and the State and local governments which own or control the highway rights-of-way.

Under existing Federal-aid law, the Federal Government can and does reimburse the States for the Federal matching share of the cost of construction of Federal-aid roads. If the State, pursuant to its own laws and regulations, is able to certify that utility relocation expense is a proper charge to the construction cost of a highway, then that expense is included in the total construction cost for which the State is reimbursed by the Federal Government to the extent of the Federal share, which is basically 50 percent of the total cost. If, however, because of inhibitions in its laws and regulations, the State is unable to certify utility relocation expense as a proper charge to the highway-construction cost, then there is no avenue under existing Federal-aid law by which any Federal funds could be applied toward meeting the relocation expense.

It is clear that such inequities as may exist are due to relationships between the utilities and the State or local governments rather than relationships with the Federal Government. It would seem neither feasible nor desirable for the Federal Government to give direction to those local relationships by force of application of Federal funds. Furthermore, no evidence was presented as to any attempt to resolve the local relationships among the parties directly involved.

The committee feels, however, that it would be helpful to have a thorough study and analysis of all factors relating to this problem, including estimates of costs and analyses of existing State laws and regulations. It has therefore approved language calling for such a study, with a report to be made to the President for transmittal to Congress not later than February 1, 1955. It is expected that this study will be conducted on the basis of impartial facts and objectivity.

CLARIFICATION OF EXISTING HIGHWAY LAW

Over the years, there have been many modifications of the laws governing the Federal-aid highway program. In the 38 years of growth since the program was initiated, it was inevitable that various overlapping, conflicts, and duplications would creep into the large body of law accumulated over that period. This has never operated to retard progress of the program, but as time goes on uncertainties in interpretations of the laws are likely to increase. The committee has therefore adopted language which directs the Secretary to prepare and submit to the committees of Congress a suggested draft of legislation which will incorporate the substantive provisions of existing law together with such modifications as may be advisable to clarify any uncertainties that might arise.

HIGHWAY FINANCING STUDY

The committee believes that the magnitude of the existing problems of financing an adequate national highway system make it timely to call upon the Commissioner of Public Roads to make a comprehensive study of all phases of these problems including studies of the progress and feasibility of toll roads and their possible effects upon the Federal-aid programs. Some concern has also been expressed as to coordination of toll roads with one another and with connections to the Federal-aid systems. Language directing a study for these purposes has been incorporated in the bill.

Calendar No. 1092

83^D CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

S. 3184

[Report No. 1093]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 25 (legislative day, MARCH 1), 1954

Mr. MARTIN (for himself, Mr. CASE, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. BEALL, Mr. UPTON, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. KERR, Mr. GORE, Mr. BURKE, and Mr. THYE) introduced the following bill ; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Public Works

MARCH 25 (legislative day, MARCH 1), 1954

Reported by Mr. CASE, without amendment

A BILL

To amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the
4 Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat.
5 355), and all Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary
6 thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the
7 sum of \$760,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,
8 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30,
9 1957.

1 The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be
2 available for expenditure as follows:

3 (a) \$342,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid pri-
4 mary highway system.

5 (b) \$228,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid sec-
6 ondary system.

7 (c) \$190,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid pri-
8 mary highway system in urban areas, and for projects on
9 approved extensions of the Federal-aid secondary system
10 within urban areas.

11 The sums authorized by this section for each fiscal year,
12 respectively, shall be apportioned among the several States
13 in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with
14 the formulas set forth in section 4 of the Federal-Aid High-
15 way Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat.
16 838).

17 Any sums apportioned to any State under the provision
18 of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State
19 for two years after the close of the fiscal year for which such
20 sums are authorized, and any amount so apportioned remain-
21 ing unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse: *Pro-*
22 *vided*, That such funds for any fiscal year shall be deemed to
23 have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums
24 apportioned to the State for such fiscal year is covered by
25 formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the

1 improvement of specific projects as provided by this Act:
2 *Provided further*, That in the case of those sums apportioned
3 to any State for projects on the Federal-aid secondary high-
4 way system, the Secretary of Commerce may discharge his
5 responsibility relative to the plans, design, inspection, and
6 construction of such secondary road projects by his receiving
7 and approving a certified statement by the State highway
8 department setting forth that the plans, design, and construc-
9 tion for such projects are in accord with the standards and
10 procedures of the respective States applicable to projects in
11 this category approved by him in accordance with the objec-
12 tives set forth in section 1 (b) of the Federal-Aid Highway
13 Act of 1950, and containing satisfactory assurances that such
14 projects will be maintained in accordance with existing law.

15 SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of expediting the construc-
16 tion, reconstruction, and improvement, inclusive of necessary
17 bridges and tunnels, of the national system of interstate high-
18 ways, including extensions thereof through urban areas,
19 designated in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of
20 the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838),
21 there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional
22 sum of \$150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,
23 1956, and a like additional sum for the fiscal year ending
24 June 30, 1957. The sum herein authorized for each fiscal
25 year shall be apportioned among the several States in the

1 following manner: one-half in the ratio which the popula-
2 tion of each State bears to the total population of all the
3 States, as shown by the latest available Federal census:
4 *Provided*, That no State shall receive less than three-fourths
5 of 1 per centum of the money so apportioned; and one-half
6 in the manner now provided by law for apportionment of
7 funds for the Federal-aid primary system: *Provided further*,
8 That the Federal share payable on account of any
9 project on the national system of interstate highways provided
10 for by funds made available under the provisions of this sec-
11 tion shall be increased to 60 per centum of the total cost
12 thereof, plus a percentage of the remaining 40 per centum of
13 such cost in any State containing unappropriated and unre-
14 served public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual
15 and tribal, exceeding 5 per centum of the total area of all
16 lands therein, equal to the percentage that the area of such
17 lands in such State is of its total area.

18 Any sums apportioned to any State under the pro-
19 visions of this section shall be available for expenditure in
20 that State for two years after the close of fiscal year for which
21 such sums are authorized: *Provided*, That such funds shall be
22 deemed to be expended upon execution of formal agreements
23 with the Secretary of Commerce for the improvement of
24 specific projects under this section.

1 (c) Any amount apportioned to the States under the
2 provisions of this section unexpended at the end of the
3 period during which it is available for expenditure under
4 the terms of subsection (b) of this section shall lapse.

5 SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions
6 of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218),
7 as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized
8 to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of
9 \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and
10 a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957; and (2)
11 for forest development roads and trails the sum of \$25,000,000
12 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum
13 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957: *Provided*,
14 That with respect to any proposed construction or recon-
15 struction of a timber access road, advisory public hearings
16 shall be held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area
17 of construction or reconstruction with notice and reasonable
18 opportunity for interested persons to present their views
19 as to the practicability and feasibility of such construction
20 or reconstruction: *Provided further*, That hereafter funds
21 available for forest development roads and trails shall also
22 be available for vehicular parking areas: *Provided further*,
23 That the appropriation herein authorized for forest highways
24 shall be apportioned by the Secretary of Commerce for ex-

1 penditure in the several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico in
2 accordance with the provision of section 3 of the Federal-
3 Aid Highway Act of 1950.

4 SEC. 4. (a) For the construction, reconstruction, and
5 improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary
6 bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas ad-
7 ministered by the National Park Service, including areas
8 authorized to be established as national parks and monu-
9 ments, and national park and monument approach roads
10 authorized by the Act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat. 1053),
11 as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated
12 the sum of \$12,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,
13 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30,
14 1957.

15 (b) For the construction, reconstruction, and improve-
16 ment of parkways, authorized by Acts of Congress, on lands
17 to which title is vested in the United States, there is hereby
18 authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$12,500,000 for
19 the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for
20 the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

21 (c) For the construction, improvement, and mainte-
22 nance of Indian reservation roads and bridges and roads and
23 bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian
24 lands under the provisions of the Act approved May 26,
25 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be

1 appropriated the sum of \$12,500,000 for the fiscal year
2 ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year
3 ending June 30, 1957: *Provided*, That the location, type,
4 and design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be
5 approved by the Secretary of Commerce before any expendi-
6 tures are made thereon, and all such construction shall be
7 under the general supervision of the Secretary of Commerce.

8 SEC. 5. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of
9 section 10 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64
10 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated
11 for the survey, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance
12 of main roads through unappropriated or unreserved public
13 lands, nontaxable Indian lands, or other Federal reservations
14 the sum of \$2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,
15 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30,
16 1957, to remain available until expended.

17 SEC. 6. Any funds heretofore, herein, or hereafter author-
18 ized for forest highways, forest development roads and trails,
19 park roads and trails, parkways, Indian roads, and public
20 lands highways shall be immediately available for contract:
21 *Provided*, That any amount remaining unexpended two
22 years after the close of the fiscal year for which authorized
23 shall lapse. The Secretary of the Department charged with
24 the administration of such funds is hereby granted authority
25 to incur obligations, approve projects, and enter into con-

1 tracts under such authorizations and his action in doing so
2 shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Gov-
3 ernment for the payment of the cost thereof and such funds
4 shall be deemed to have been expended when so obligated.

5 SEC. 7. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of
6 section 1 of the Act entitled “An Act to provide for co-
7 operation with Central American Republics in the construc-
8 tion of the Inter-American Highway”, approved December
9 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 860), as amended by section 11 of
10 the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September
11 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized to be
12 appropriated, in addition to the sums heretofore authorized,
13 the sum of \$8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,
14 1955, and a like sum for each fiscal year thereafter up to
15 and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, to be
16 available until expended, to enable the United States to
17 cooperate with the Governments of the American Republics
18 situated in Central America—that is, with the Governments
19 of the Republics of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala,
20 Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama—in the survey and com-
21 pletion of construction of the Inter-American Highway
22 within the borders of the aforesaid Republics, respectively.
23 Not to exceed one-third of the appropriation authorized for
24 each fiscal year may be expended without requiring the
25 country or countries in which such sums may be expended

1 to match any part thereof, if the Secretary of State shall find
2 that the cost of constructing said highway in such country or
3 countries will be beyond their reasonable capacity to bear.

4 SEC. 8. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions
5 of section 5 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 (66
6 Stat. 158), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated
7 to the Department of State, in addition to the sums hereto-
8 fore authorized, the sum of \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year
9 ending June 30, 1955, and a like sum for the fiscal year
10 ending June 30, 1956, to be available until expended, for
11 completing the United States obligation under the applicable
12 agreement with the Republic of Nicaragua: *Provided*, That
13 the survey and construction work authorized by the said
14 section 5 shall be under the general supervision of the Secre-
15 tary of Commerce.

16 SEC. 9. (a) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized
17 in his discretion to engage in research on all phases of high-
18 way construction, reconstruction, modernization, develop-
19 ment, design, maintenance, safety, financing, and traffic con-
20 ditions, including the effect thereon of State laws, and is
21 authorized to test, develop, or assist in the testing and develop-
22 ing of any material, invention, patented article, or process.
23 The Secretary may carry out the authority granted hereby,
24 either independently, or in cooperation with any other branch

1 of the Government, State agency, authority, association, in-
2 stitution, corporation (profit or nonprofit), or any other
3 organization, or person. The funds required to carry out
4 the provisions of this subsection shall be taken out of the
5 administrative and research funds authorized by section 21
6 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 212), as amended.
7 The provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41
8 U. S. C., sec. 5) shall not be applicable to contracts or
9 agreements made under the authority of this subsection.

10 (b) The Secretary shall include in the highway research
11 program herein authorized studies of desirable weight and
12 size standards for vehicles using the public highways and of
13 the feasibility of uniformity in State regulations with respect
14 to such standards, and he shall report from time to time to the
15 Committees on Public Works of the Senate and of the House
16 of Representatives on the progress and findings with respect
17 to such studies.

18 SEC. 10. The Commissioner of Public Roads is hereby
19 directed to make a study in cooperation with the State high-
20 way departments and other parties in interest relative to the
21 problems posed by necessary relocation and reconstruction
22 of public utilities services resulting from highway improve-
23 ments authorized under this Act. Among other things, such
24 a study shall include a review and financial analysis of exist-

1 ing relationships between the State highway departments and
2 affected utilities of all types, and a review of the various State
3 statutes regulating existing relationships, to the end that a full
4 and informative report may be made to the President for
5 transmittal to the Congress of the United States not later
6 than February 1, 1955.

7 SEC. 11. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized and
8 directed to transmit to the Committees on Public Works of
9 the Senate and of the House of Representatives not later than
10 December 31, 1954, a suggested draft of a bill or bills for a
11 Federal Highway Act, which will include such provisions of
12 existing law, and such changed or new provisions as the
13 Secretary deems advisable. The Secretary shall also submit
14 a report commenting on the draft of bill or bills, which shall
15 include specific reference to each change in, or omission of,
16 any provision of existing law.

17 SEC. 12. The Commissioner of Public Roads is author-
18 ized and directed to make a comprehensive study of all phases
19 of highway financing, including a study of the progress and
20 feasibility of toll roads with particular attention to the possi-
21 ble effects of such toll roads upon the Federal-aid highway
22 programs, and coordination thereof, and to make a report of
23 his findings including recommendations with respect to Fed-
24 eral participation in toll roads, to be submitted to the Congress

1 not later than February 1, 1955: *Provided*, That not to ex-
2 ceed \$100,000 from funds available for administrative ex-
3 penses shall be expended for the purposes of this section.

4 SEC. 13. At any time that the President may determine
5 that the level of national employment is such as to warrant
6 an increase in the volume of highway construction, he is
7 hereby authorized to advance the effective dates of any
8 authorizations in this Act, except the authorizations in sec-
9 tions 7 and 8, to a date not more than one year earlier than
10 the dates which would otherwise become effective.

11 SEC. 14. For the purpose of expediting the interstate
12 planning and coordination of a continuous Great River Road
13 and appurtenances thereto traversing the Mississippi Valley
14 from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico in general conformity
15 with the provisions of the Federal Aid Road Act of July 11,
16 1916, as amended and supplemented, and with the recom-
17 mended plan set forth in the joint report submitted to the
18 Congress November 28, 1951, by the Secretaries of Com-
19 merce and Interior pursuant to the Act of August 24, 1949
20 (Public Law 262, Eighty-first Congress), there is hereby
21 authorized to be expended by the Secretary of Commerce
22 from general administrative funds not to exceed \$100,000;
23 the amount expended under this section shall be apportioned
24 among the ten States bordering the Mississippi River in pro-

1 portion to the amount allocated by these respective States
2 for the improvement and extension of existing sections of this
3 highway project as approved by the Secretary of Commerce
4 in cooperation with other public agencies concerned there-
5 with.

6 SEC. 15. The term "highway", as defined in section 2
7 of the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921 (42
8 Stat. 212), as amended and supplemented, shall be deemed
9 to include "tunnels".

10 SEC. 16. The Secretary of Commerce may approve as
11 a part of the Federal-aid secondary system, extensions
12 through urban areas, connecting points on that system, pro-
13 vided that Federal participation in projects on such exten-
14 sions shall be limited to urban funds.

15 SEC. 17. (a) Highway construction work performed in
16 pursuance of agreements between the Secretary of Commerce
17 and any State highway department which requires approval
18 by the Secretary of Commerce and which is financed in whole
19 or in part by funds authorized under this or succeeding Acts,
20 shall be performed by contract awarded by competitive bid-
21 ding under such procedures as may by regulations be pre-
22 scribed by the Secretary of Commerce, unless the Secretary
23 of Commerce shall affirmatively find that, under the circum-
24 stances relating to a given project, some other method is in

1 the public interest. All such findings shall be reported
2 promptly in writing to the Committees on Public Works of
3 the Senate and the House of Representatives.

4 (b) In any case in which approval by the Secretary of
5 Commerce of any contract for such highway construction
6 work is required, the Secretary shall require as a condition
7 precedent to such approval a sworn statement executed by,
8 or on behalf of, the person, firm, association, or corporation
9 to whom such contract is to be awarded, certifying that such
10 person, firm, association, or corporation has not, either di-
11 rectly or indirectly, entered into any agreement, participated
12 in any collusion, or otherwise taken any action in restraint
13 of free competitive bidding in connection with such contract.

14 SEC. 18. Section 1020 of title 18 of the United States
15 Code is amended to read as follows:

16 “§ 1020. Highway projects

17 “Whoever, being an officer, agent, or employee of the
18 United States, or of any State or Territory, or whoever,
19 whether a person, association, firm, or corporation, know-
20 ingly makes any false statement, false representation, or
21 false report as to the character, quality, quantity, or cost of
22 the material used or to be used, or the quantity or quality
23 of the work performed or to be performed, or the costs
24 thereof in connection with the submission of plans, maps,
25 specifications, contracts, or costs of construction of any high-

1 way or related project submitted for approval to the Secre-
2 tary of Commerce; or

3 “Whoever knowingly makes any false statement, false
4 representation, false report, or false claim with respect to the
5 character, quality, quantity, or cost of any work performed
6 or to be performed, or materials furnished or to be furnished,
7 in connection with the construction of any highway or
8 related project approved by the Secretary of Commerce; or

9 “Whoever knowingly makes any false statement or
10 false representation as to a material fact in any statement,
11 certificate, or report submitted pursuant to the provisions
12 of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39
13 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented,

14 “Shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not
15 more than five years, or both.”

16 SEC. 19. All provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act
17 of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838); the
18 Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, approved June 29, 1948
19 (62 Stat. 1105); and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950,
20 approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785); and the
21 Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952, approved June 25,
22 1952 (66 Stat. 158), not inconsistent with this Act, shall
23 remain in full force and effect.

24 SEC. 20. If any section, subsection, or other provision
25 of this Act or the application thereof to any person or cir-

1 cumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act and
2 the application of such section, subsection, or other provi-
3 sion to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected
4 thereby.

5 SEC. 21. All Acts or parts of Acts in any way inconsist-
6 ent with the provisions of this Act are hereby repealed, and
7 this Act shall take effect on its passage.

8 SEC. 22. This Act may be cited as the “Federal-Aid
9 Highway Act of 1954”.

A BILL

To amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

By Mr. MARTIN, Mr. CASE, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. BEALL, Mr. UPTON, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HOL-
LAND, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. KEHR, Mr. GORE,
Mr. BURKE, and Mr. TITHE

MARCH 25 (legislative day, MARCH 1), 1954
Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Public Works

MARCH 25 (legislative day, MARCH 1), 1954
Reported without amendment

have it printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES ON THE OCCASION OF THE 133d ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF GREECE, MARCH 25, 1954

Once again it is my privilege to greet and congratulate those of my fellow citizens who trace their ancestry to the shores of Greece.

All of the free world owes an incalculable debt to Greece. It is a debt that can be traced back to the earliest glories of that nation—an era that gave the world so much of its culture, its art, its philosophy, its literature. The glory that was Greece has indeed become through the centuries the glory of the entire human race.

And in modern times, too, Greece has been able to inspire humanity. Though communism blazed at its very borders, Greece clung indomitably to its beliefs in the independence and in the dignity of man. It has never been afraid to fight for freedom. And while it fought for freedom it never allowed itself to be terrorized by greater odds.

We in America are proud of the fact that we were able to lend Greece support against such odds. The Greek people know that this country is a friend and ally which will never flinch in the common struggle to establish human liberty everywhere on this earth. When we observe Greece's day of independence, as we do on this March 25, we observe a day which is significant and symbolic of freedom the world over.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Greece. In Minnesota we have many outstanding businessmen who came from Greece, and we are very proud of their accomplishments in our State.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the 133d anniversary of Greek independence is a fitting occasion to pay tribute to a proud and determined people which today upholds the cause of democracy and freedom on the Balkan Peninsula just as it did more than 2,000 years ago. After having suffered both Nazi-Fascist and Communist terror, Greece is today gradually inching its way forward to the goal of achieving economic and political stability within the democratic framework.

As Americans we can proudly say that we have helped make it possible for Greece to be free today. It was the courage of the former President Harry S. Truman, his determination not only to talk against Communists but to fight them where it really counted, that preserved the freedom of Greece against Soviet aggression. When many Americans were too complacent to concern themselves with the gathering storm on the international scene, Harry Truman saw the danger. He called the Congress into special session late in 1947 to propose the now famous Truman doctrine. This was the step that alerted our country to the Communist danger and ultimately stopped the Soviet aggressor.

Thus Greece is free today, free to celebrate its Independence Day in the very country in which the democratic form of government was first evolved, and on this occasion it is appropriate for us to extend our felicitations to the descendants of the people from whom the Western World has derived so much of its heritage.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, today is the 133d anniversary of Greek inde-

pendence in 1821 and the rebirth of that great and glorious nation. Throughout the 133 years the courageous people of Greece have constantly and nobly defended their liberties. As fighters for freedom and liberty in the world, they have earned our high admiration and heartfelt gratitude.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, a statement by myself on this subject.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

Today we celebrate the anniversary which must stir the heart and soul of every free man everywhere in the world. This is the 133d anniversary of Greek independence—of the rebirth of the great nation of Greece, whose past glories were, by the great events of 1821, given lineal continuity in the modern Greek nation.

All free men everywhere must be aware of the basic legacy which they have inherited from the ancient struggles and achievements of the Greek people. Wherever free men gather they must recall the courage and sacrifice of Leonidas at Thermopylae, the great ideological contributions of Plato and Socrates, and the great achievements in statecraft of Theseus and Pericles.

One hundred and thirty-three years ago the Greek people, armed with these great traditions, recaptured their independence. In very recent years they had to struggle again to regain and retain that independence and that freedom. Again, the people of Greece stood fast against the gathered forces of tyranny, and again they held firm. Today, the people of Greece, as acknowledged allies of the United States, stand guard on the borders of the Soviet Union. We are proud that we were able to assist in their historic victory of 1947-51 through the military-aid program and the Marshall plan. In more recent months we have been able to assist in the rehabilitation of Greece through the point 4 program. I believe firmly that we must continue to work with the Greek people in our mutual-aid programs.

We have another obligation to the valiant people of Greece which we have not fulfilled, and which we in the United States must rectify. I speak now of our immigration laws.

The McCarran-Walter Immigration Act allocates a pitifully small quota for individuals born in Greece desiring to come to the United States. The annual quota is only 310—and half of that number is mortgaged until the year 2013. This means that immigration from Greece is cut down to a trickle and reserved to those with a very high priority who have long been on the waiting list.

This disgraceful treatment of the Greek people is a result of the national origins quota system of the McCarran-Walter Act. I believe that all Americans must dedicate themselves to the elimination of this system which is an affront to the very concept of Americanism and an insult to our allies and friends throughout the world. We must replace the national origins quota system and the entire McCarran-Walter Act with a just and humane law that will reflect the great American traditions of justice, equality, and humanity for all peoples.

I had hoped that the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 would, in some small part, counteract the worst features of the McCarran-Walter Act and extend some additional immigration quotas to the Greek peoples. My hopes were not well founded. This emergency measure has so far turned out to be unworkable. In the first 8 months of its operation only 7

persons out of an overall authorization of 211,000 have been admitted to the United States. Unless the unworkable features of the Refugee Relief Act are removed, it will turn out to be a fraud not only upon the American people, but also upon our friends throughout the world.

On this anniversary of Greek independence, I wish to repledge my efforts to Americans of Greek descent, and to the people of Greece who are so fundamentally concerned with the operation of our immigration laws, to continue to work for the revision and liberalization of these laws.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by me in tribute to the Greek people.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

I want to pay tribute today to one of the great peoples of the world, the Greeks. Though a small nation, no peoples have had a more brilliant history than the Greeks in the sciences, arts, letters, and in government.

Today is the 133d anniversary of Greek independence. After centuries of oppression under tyrannical rule, it was in 1821 that the Greeks threw off the yoke of the Ottoman Turks and proclaimed their independence. The Greeks have always fought bravely for freedom and independence. They fought brilliantly in World War II, and emerged once again from subjection into the bright light of freedom. Communism, with the Greeks again fighting bravely, met its first real setback on this great little peninsula.

Who has not read and thrilled at the great plays of Aeschylus, Euripides, Sophocles, and the comedies of Aristophanes; the logic and wisdom of Plato and Aristotle; the histories of Thucydides and Xenophon. In the art of sculpture the Greeks have never been excelled.

To attempt to catalog the living stream of wondrous thought, arts, and sciences that has come down to us today from the people of Greece would be impossible in this place. Libraries of history will forever testify to their contributions to the human race. Moreover, they knew freedom—the freedom of debate and popular government—before the Western World had dreamed of such a radical innovation. It is not without cause that scholars have argued that man's Golden Age was achieved in Greece.

I am sure we all feel in our hearts thanksgiving for the great contributions of this noble race. And that we pray that Greece will continue to celebrate her anniversaries of independence in peace and in freedom.

THREE HUNDRED AND TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF MARYLAND—ISSUANCE OF SPECIAL STAMPS COMMEMORATIVE OF THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF FORT CUMBERLAND, MD.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the State of Maryland today celebrates the 320th anniversary of the founding of the Free State.

Three hundred and twenty years ago, exactly 320 men arrived at St. Clement's Island aboard the Ark and the Dove. Their crossing had been a dangerous one, in fact, almost disastrous. Those 320 men—history does not record the exact number of women with them—had fled England in order to establish in the New World a colony where they might worship as they pleased. The lit-

the group included members of both the Catholic and Protestant faiths.

When they arrived at St. Clement's Island, they established what was to become the State of Maryland, but they also created something even greater, and which had a marked effect on the future of the New World. They had come to this country so that they might follow the religion of their choice; but, contrary to the prevailing practice of those days, these colonists, while the majority were Catholics, did not insist that all those who lived in the new colony should be Catholics. For the first time, a society permitted a man to worship as his conscience dictated; and the Maryland Charter thus established the religious freedom which later was to be written into the Constitution of this great Nation.

Those 320 men created the spirit and the legal basis for the religious freedom now enjoyed by the 160 million people of this country. That was the most significant contribution which Maryland colonists made to this Nation.

However, during its history of 320 years the State of Maryland has added much to the welfare and progress of the Nation, and, in fact, can be said to have twice saved the United States.

The first time, it is reported, was during the Revolution, when a small battalion of Marylanders fought the Battle of Brooklyn. It will be recalled that the army of General Washington had been fairly well routed by the British. The little group of Marylanders acting as a rear guard held off the British until General Washington could evacuate his troops and regroup them. Had those Marylanders failed, it is almost a certainty that the colonists would then and there have lost the Revolutionary War.

The second time Maryland saved the Nation is said to have been during the War of 1812, when Marylanders defended Baltimore against a 3-day amphibian attack, which has been called "one of the decisive battles of the modern world."

Maryland's 320 years record many other historic events which helped shape this Nation. Because of the great contribution Maryland has made, because of our State's illustrious history, we Marylanders proudly celebrate the anniversary of the founding of a great State.

Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the 200th anniversary of the founding of Fort Cumberland. I am introducing this bill on a very appropriate day, which is Maryland Day, the 320th anniversary of the founding of the great Free State of Maryland, to which I have just addressed myself.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3182) to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the 200th anniversary of the founding of Fort Cumberland, introduced by Mr. BEALL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY AUTHORIZATIONS

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I introduce a bill providing Federal-aid highway authorizations for the fiscal years 1956 and 1957. This bill is cosponsored by the following members of the Committee on Public Works:

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. UPTON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE], and myself. I ask to have the name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] added to the list of sponsors.

The bill (S. 3184) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MARTIN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. MARTIN. The bill represents hours of hard work by all members of the committee and particularly by the able and distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Roads, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The Committee on Public Works agreed to report this bill, providing for continuation of Federal highway aid after extensive hearings and study. I think all members of the committee are very deeply concerned over the condition of our highways today. We know that our highway network is one of the principal transportation arteries which carry the lifeblood of American progress and prosperity. For many years our highways have not kept pace with traffic needs. We cannot afford to neglect them any longer.

The committee considered requests for Federal participation in highway improvement ranging from the current authorization of \$712,500,000 up to \$2,200,000,000 per year. The State and local governments have been stepping up their annual highway expenditures steadily. We were asked to give more consideration to the fact that the Federal Government is now collecting excise taxes on gasoline and automotive equipment in a total amount of more than three times the Federal contribution for highway improvement.

The total cost of completing the deficiencies in the Federal-aid system is a little more than \$35 billion. Roughly half of this amount, or \$17½ billion, would be the Federal Government's share under existing law. It was evident that the new authorizations must be stepped up if we are ever to bring our highways up to a reasonable state of improvement. Most members of the committee agreed with this view. The bill as approved by the committee provides for increasing the Federal contribution to a total of \$1 billion per year for the fiscal years 1956 and 1957. This is still less than

half of the annual collections from automotive taxes and is about equivalent to current collections for taxes on gasoline and oil alone.

I think this bill represents a realistic approach which will stimulate all authorities responsible for highway improvement toward greater progress and a quicker realization of the further benefits that will come with adequate highway facilities.

I have prepared a summary of the amounts recommended in the new bill together with a comparison of the amounts in existing law and in the bill recently passed by the House. I ask unanimous consent to have this summary printed at this point in my remarks.

Mr. McCLELLAN rose.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none, and the table may be printed in the RECORD, as requested.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask the eminent Senator from Pennsylvania whether the authorization which is proposed is \$1 billion a year for 2 years, or a total of \$1 billion.

Mr. MARTIN. It is \$1 billion a year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Or a total of \$2 billion?

Mr. MARTIN. A total of \$2 billion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. How does that compare with the amounts appropriated in past years?

Mr. MARTIN. It is about 33½ percent above any appropriation heretofore made.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask the Senator how he can reconcile this proposed increase in appropriations with the declaration of the administration and of Republican leaders that the budget must be balanced.

Mr. MARTIN. I did not intend to get into a discussion of that subject, but for 50 years, as I have stated, I have favored greater appropriations for national defense. I would cut national defense appropriations and foreign aid to the point where we could reduce taxes and balance the budget, and also make increased appropriations for highway construction. It will require almost 10 years, even at the present rate of appropriations, to bring the roads of the United States up to the standard on which they should be right now. We are adding more than 3 million motor vehicles to the roads every year.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the Senator from Pennsylvania made a unanimous-consent request which was not granted.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. What was the unanimous consent request?

Mr. MARTIN. I asked unanimous consent that a table which I presented, showing the amounts recommended in the new bill, together with a comparison of the amounts under existing law and in the bill recently passed by the House be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That request was granted. There was no request for an extension of time.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have been on my feet all through this discussion, trying to obtain recognition. I was on my feet before the unanimous-consent request was granted.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas does not have the floor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I was on my feet addressing the Chair from the moment the Senator from Pennsylvania used the words "unanimous consent." I did not hear the request acted upon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The unanimous-consent request had been granted by the Chair.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It may have been, but if a Senator is on his feet addressing the Chair and seeking recognition—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The power of recognition rests with the Chair.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in the light of the circumstances, I ask unanimous consent that the action by which the unanimous-consent request was agreed to be vacated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wish to commend the able Senator from Pennsylvania and his committee for the action they have taken. I also wish to ask a question or two about the bill. I congratulate and commend the Senator and his committee. For years we have not been appropriating adequate funds for Federal highway construction. Having received information that the Senator's committee had acted as he has indicated on the bill referred, I invite the attention of the able Senator from Pennsylvania and other Senators to the fact that yesterday afternoon I submitted an amendment, which I expect to call up today, to the pending bill, to hereafter freeze the revenues from taxes on gasoline and fuel oil for the purpose of highway construction only.

In line with the recommendations of the able Senator's committee, I trust the Senate will adopt the amendment which I have proposed to the pending bill. It does not increase the taxes and it does not lower the taxes. However, it recognizes the seriousness of the highway problem. By adopting my amendment we can make sure that hereafter the Federal gasoline taxes and the Federal fuel taxes which are now imposed shall be

made available only for the purpose of constructing highways.

I merely wished to call to the attention of the Senate the amendment which I shall offer to the pending bill later today, so that Members may be thinking about it in the meantime. If the committee of the Senator from Pennsylvania is correct and has acted wisely in taking its present position, as reflected by the bill just reported by the Senator from Pennsylvania, Congress can go one step further and insure that that program will be carried out.

I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Comparative data on highway authorization bills for fiscal 1956 and 1957

Types	Present law, fiscal 1954 and 1955	H. R. 8127 as passed by House	Senate committee bill
Federal-aid systems:			
Primary (45 percent).....	\$247,500,000	\$270,000,000	\$342,000,000
Secondary (30 percent).....	165,000,000	180,000,000	228,000,000
Urban (25 percent).....	137,500,000	150,000,000	190,000,000
Subtotal.....	550,000,000	600,000,000	760,000,000
Interstate system.....	25,000,000	200,000,000	150,000,000
Total Federal-aid systems.....	575,000,000	800,000,000	910,000,000
Federally built roads on or to federally owned or controlled lands:			
Forest highways.....	22,500,000	22,500,000	25,000,000
Forest roads and trails.....	22,500,000	22,500,000	25,000,000
Park roads and trails.....	10,000,000	10,000,000	12,500,000
Indian roads.....	10,000,000	10,000,000	12,500,000
Parkways.....	10,000,000	10,000,000	12,500,000
Public lands.....	2,500,000	-----	2,500,000
Totals.....	77,500,000	75,000,000	90,000,000
Grand total for highways in United States.....	652,500,000	875,000,000	1,000,000,000

Mr. THYE subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] for having introduced a bill relating to Federal aid in the construction of State highways. Our national highways must be improved. Far too many casualties occur on our highways because they are not in a safe condition. For that reason I am happy to have the privilege of joining with the Senator from Pennsylvania in the introduction of the bill.

Subsequently,

Mr. CASE, from the Committee on Public Works, to which was referred the bill (S. 3184) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report (No. 1093) thereon.

PROTECTING AMERICA'S HERITAGE OF FREEDOM

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I wish to invite the Senate's attention to a handsome brochure prepared by the Mosler Safe Co. of Hamilton, Ohio, and entitled "Protecting America's Heritage of Freedom."

This beautiful publication contains facsimile reproductions of the three basic charters of American freedom—the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and the first ten amendments to the Constitution known as the Bill of Rights. The publication summarizes the history of

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] for his usual courtesy.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

each of our precious charters of freedom. In addition, the story is told of the exhibition and safekeeping of these priceless documents from 1776 to the present time.

It is particularly appropriate at this critical time in our history to find available for wide distribution such a splendid reproduction of America's birth certificates. Too many of our schools today place primary emphasis on new international charters, declarations and covenants. While no reasonable person would deny the value of such instruction, it must never be permitted to obscure the most magnificent and the most practical plan ever devised for maintaining inviolate the God-given and inalienable rights of man. The religious concept of freedom stated in the Declaration of Independence, legally embodied in the Constitution, and further protected by the Bill of Rights must always be held paramount to all other political documents.

It is a source of special pride to me that an Ohio company was chosen to provide for the physical security of our country's three most treasured documents. When these documents are not on display in the National Archives, or in case of emergency, they are lowered into a specially designed 50-ton safe constructed at Mosler's plant in Hamilton, Ohio. To the management and employees of the Mosler Safe Co., my sincere congratulations for the excellence of their work in securing the physical safety of America's irreplaceable documents. More important, those security precautions reflect a common determination to guard the principles no less vigilantly than the parchment.

Mr. President, I understand, of course, that the remarks I have made will be printed in the body of the RECORD, but I ask unanimous consent that the articles—not the three documents themselves—be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

[The articles appear in the Appendix of today's RECORD under the headline "Protecting America's Heritage of Freedom.]

THE CONSTITUTION AND THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, yesterday, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I reported Senate Joint Resolution 44, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the composition and jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States. I am the sponsor of the joint resolution.

In the January 1954 issue of the Insurance Counsel Journal there appears a very excellent article entitled "The Constitution and the Supreme Court," which discusses the resolution and urges its adoption. It is written by Mr. Henry W. Nichols, vice president and general counsel of the National Surety Corp. of New York.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONSTITUTION AND THE SUPREME COURT
(By Henry W. Nichols, vice president and general counsel, National Surety Corp., New York, N. Y.)

The inspired leadership of our forefathers put together age-old principles to form a constitutional government for freemen, such as the world had never known. The built-in checks and balances established in and between our executive, legislative, and judicial branches is one of our great heritages. Every lawyer has an abiding faith in our triune form of government and is jealous of its preservation. Every lawyer worthy of the great traditions of his office has a deep affection for the Supreme Court of the United States and is gravely concerned with what happens, not only to that august tribunal but to our entire judicial system. It is with this in mind that attention is brought to a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States which would affect the personnel and jurisdiction of the Court. It arose from the attempt to pack the Supreme Court and, among other things, would fix permanently the number of Justices. The proposed amendment has for its purpose the preservation of the efficiency and independence of the Court. The Supreme Court is not now constituted in the manner in which most people of the country believe it to be.

This proposed amendment is now before Congress in a joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives.¹ While it has been in the making for several years and has been debated and approved by the American Bar Association² and by several prominent

local bar associations,³ the proposed amendment is not generally known. Most lawyers who have given the subject thoughtful consideration favor the proposed amendment. The matters involved are not political but are fundamental. I feel confident that bar associations everywhere will support it when it has been properly presented.

The first official hearing upon the proposed amendment was held in Washington on January 29, 1954, before the Subcommittee on the Constitution of the Senate Judiciary Committee. This hearing was given publicity by the press and it is expected that from here on the proposed amendment will be more and more before the public. It is expected that before long the proposed amendment will be weighed by the full Judiciary Committees of the Senate and House. Lawyers will debate its merits. Therefore, it is timely that the International Association of Insurance Counsel bring it to the attention of the readers of its journal.

There is nothing presently immutable about the number of Justices who constitute the United States Supreme Court. By legislation, Congress may fix the number of Justices at 15 or even 21, should it ever see fit to do so. Presently the Court consists of a Chief Justice and eight Associate Justices. The number of Associate Justices has in the past been changed a number of times. "From its number of 5 in the original Judiciary Act of 1789, it had been increased to 6 in 1807, to 8 in 1837, and to 9 in 1863. An act of 1866 would have reduced the Associate Justices to 6 but before sufficient vacancies had occurred thus to reduce the Court, the act of 1869 was passed, which reconstituted the Court with a Chief Justice and 8 Associate Justices, as it remains at present."⁴ No doubt, a variety of considerations, political and otherwise, prompted the Congress from time to time to alter the number of Justices constituting the Court. The expansion of our western frontier and the establishment of new circuits resulting in an increased volume of litigation coming before the Court were contributing factors. Historians tell us that political considerations arising out of the emotional issue of slavery had their effect. The desire to influence the Court's position with respect to slavery and the collateral questions flowing therefrom probably induced some in Government to seek changes in the number of Justices.⁵ The 1866 act was enacted to prevent President Andrew Johnson from having the opportunity to make appointments as vacancies might occur and thereby perpetuate his ideas on reconstruction in Supreme Court decisions. With Johnson out of office the Court was again increased to a Chief Justice and eight Associate Justices, as it remains at present.

The omission of the Constitution to fix the number of Justices of the Supreme Court has been characterized as "a weak point, a joint in the Court's armor through which a weapon might some day penetrate."⁶ We are told that this constitutional omission is impressive because the intention to secure the independence of the judiciary was clearly expressed in the Constitution by the provisions that the President was not permitted to remove Justices, nor Congress to diminish their salaries.

In any period of unrest and of conflicting political, economic, and social ideas, the law and the courts that administer it are peculiarly the target of attacks by enemies both

within and without the country.⁷ It is easy to find loopholes in the Constitution through which other hostile attacks could be made without violating the letter of the Constitution.

We are all familiar with the attempt in 1936-37 to "pack" the Court. The bar of the country was shocked into vigorous action by this attack upon the Supreme Court at the point where James Byrce thought that it was vulnerable. Although 16 years have elapsed since the New Deal court-packing plan was suppressed, the memory of this hard fought battle is fresh in the minds of lawyers and there is always danger that sooner or later similar attacks from without may be made upon our Supreme Court. We, as lawyers, can take justifiable pride in the fact that great lawyers had a major part in establishing this triune Government and that lawyers have closely watched over its developments. At times we may have seemed indifferent or to lack in providing needed leadership for which our profession is so qualified, but worthy lawyers have never failed to stand shoulder to shoulder as a formidable phalanx when serious attacks have been made upon our Government or any one of its three great divisions.

It is disturbing to contemplate the thin margin by which the most recent major assault upon our Supreme Court was repelled. The 1936-37 court-packing plan, disguised as a plan to replace the "nine old men," was defeated largely because it became evident during the bitter controversy that the normal processes of time soon would accomplish the desired result through deaths and retirements. This proved to be the case.

No political controversy now exists among the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of our Government which could cause this proposed amendment to be the subject of political party passions. It is approved by both prominent Republicans and Democrats. Those who have studied the proposals believe that basically they are non-controversial. Some slight revisions are expected in the language of the joint resolution as originally introduced. The protection of the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court is of vital concern, and if this proposed amendment is worthy of adoption there would seem to be no reason to delay it until the subject again becomes one of peculiar urgency.

Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER of Maryland introduced the proposed amendment into the Senate on February 16, 1953, and in his introductory speech made a statement which may well become an American classic when he said: "Wherever courts suffer invasion of their independence, law ends."

The judiciary must, at all times, be free from executive or legislative control. This proposed amendment seeks to protect an independent judiciary from the executive and legislative branches of our Federal Government, which sometime again may endeavor to penetrate the constitutional loopholes which expose the Court to possible interference and undue restraints. This joint resolution is designed to plug three constitutional loopholes and, in addition, would provide for an age limit for Justices in active service.

The proposed amendment would affect the Supreme Court in these four ways: (1) It would fix the number of Justices at nine. (2) It would make their retirement compulsory at age 75 with full emoluments of office. (3) It would render the Justices ineligible to become President or Vice President within 5 years after leaving the bench. (4) In cases arising under the Constitution it would remove from the Congress its present power to impair the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court.

The suggested amendment has the clarity and simplicity that is found in the original

¹ Report of committee on proposed amendments to the Federal Constitution to New York State Bar Association, December 22, 1949.

² Encyclopedia Britannica, vol. 21, p. 587.

³ The Supreme Court in the United States, Warren.

⁴ The American Commonwealth, James Bryce.

⁵ S. J. Res. 44 (and H. J. Res. 194) appended.
⁶ Proceedings, ABA house of delegates, February 28, 1950, and September 20, 1950.

⁷ Hon. Arthur T. Vanderbilt, Minimum Standards of Judicial Administration.

Mem. 29, 1954

favor of temporary continuation of 90% dairy price supports (pp. 3780-1, 3791).

4. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. Rep. Shelley recommended distribution of surplus commodities to the needy (pp. 3781-3).
5. TAXATION. Received the conference report on H. R. 8224, the excise-tax reduction bill (pp. 3728, 3794-6).
6. ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Magnuson claimed the Hoover Commission task force on water resources contains no members to represent the public-power viewpoint (p. 378).
7. SUGAR. Rep. Willis spoke in favor of an increase in domestic sugar quotas in view of the longshoremen's strike (pp. 3789-90).
8. PRICE SUPPORTS. The Department has received a limited supply of a House Agriculture Committee Print, "Technical Studies by the United States Department of Agriculture Relating to Selected Farm Price Support Proposals."

SENATE

9. PRICE SUPPORTS. Sens. Kefauver and Thye spoke favoring passage of a resolution to continue the present dairy price supports "until the question can be fully considered by the appropriate committees" (pp. 3697-8).
Sen. Wiley spoke favoring "legislation which I have cosponsored...to forestall this parity slash" in dairy price supports (p. 3694).
10. STATEHOOD. Continued debate on S. 49, the Hawaii-Alaska statehood bill (pp. 3701-26).
11. CROP INSURANCE. Received from this Department a proposed bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to provide for payment from premium income for costs of adjusters and commissions for sales and servicing of new contracts; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 3692).
12. CLAIMS. Received from the President a supplemental budget estimate to pay claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments against the U. S.; to Appropriations Committee (S. Doc. 110) (p. 3691).
13. ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY. Sen. Wiley urged the House Rules Committee to report without delay a resolution providing for the consideration of S. 2150, to create the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and spoke against the so-called Brownson amendment which he claimed would "cripple" this project (p. 3701).
14. HOLIDAY. The "Daily Digest" states that the Judiciary Committee "indefinitely postponed further action on H. R. 7786, changing November 11 of each year from Armistice Day to Veterans Day" (p. D333).

15. ROAD AUTHORIZATIONS. In reporting S. 3184 (see Digest 56), the Public Works Committee made the following statement in its report:
"The testimony shows that a large backlog also exists in the roads on federally owned or controlled lands.... The forest roads and trails must be improved to permit economical marketing of timber on a sustained-yield basis. According to the testimony, the financial loss to the Federal Government through inability to market mature timber was about \$20 million in gross revenue in the fiscal year 1953.... In order to encourage a speedier reduction of the existing backlog the committee feels that these roads should be treated in the same manner as the

Federal-aid systems. It has included language providing for the use of contract authorizations with the same 2-year extension of availability and lapsing provisions which apply to the Federal-aid systems."

The Committee agreed to a House provision to permit simplified review of secondary-road projects but modified the provision so as to continue the requirement that the secondary-road projects be determined by the State highway department and the appropriate local officials in cooperation with each other. The bill also includes language to clarify and broaden the existing authorizations for highway research by spelling out several of the principal subjects on which research may be undertaken, including uniform weight and size standards for vehicles.

BILLS INTRODUCED

16. VEHICLES. S. 3199, by Sen. McCarthy, to authorize Government employees who are stationed in remote areas and have at their disposal Government-owned motor vehicles, to use such vehicles for transporting their children to school, to the hospital, or to a doctor's office, when and where no other means of transportation is available; to Government Operations Committee. Remarks of author (pp. 3695-6).
17. TRAVEL. S. 3200, by Sen. McCarthy, to increase the maximum per-diem allowance from \$9 to \$12; to Government Operations Committee. Remarks of author, including statement that this proposal "accords with the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget." (pp. 3695-6).
18. FEES. S. 3203, by Sen. Bricker, for himself and Mr. Johnson, Colo., to prohibit certain departments, agencies, bureaus, boards, commissions, and services of the Government from prescribing more than nominal fees or charges for inspection certificates, registrations, licenses, permits, or applications issued or provided by them; to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee (p. 3695).
19. PRICE SUPPORTS. S. 3204, by Sen. Kefauver, to continue temporarily existing 90-percent-of-parity price supports for milk and butterfat; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 3695).
H.R. 8584, by Rep. Andresen, amending the Agricultural Act of 1949 to continue temporarily existing 90 percent of parity price supports for milk and butterfat; to Agriculture Committee (p. 3797).
H.R. 8604, by Rep. Andresen, "to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949,"; to Agriculture Committee (p. 3797).
20. FOREIGN TRADE. H.R. 8585, by Rep. Baker, to assist in alleviating the effects of unemployment resulting from Federal tariff or trade policy by establishing a temporary program of supplementary grants for States which provide for liberalization of their unemployment-compensation payments to persons unemployed because of Federal tariff or trade policy; to Ways and Means Committee (p. 3797).
21. PUBLIC WORKS. H.R. 8586, by Rep. Byrne, Pa., to offset declining employment by providing for Federal assistance to States and local governments in projects of construction, alteration, expansion, or repair of public facilities and improvements; to Public Works Committee (p. 3797).
22. FEED GRAINS. H.R. 8587, by Rep. Horan, to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to provide that feed grains acquired through price-support operations shall be sold to dairy farmers at prices equivalent to 75% of parity; to Agriculture Committee (p. 3797).

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued April 2, 1954
For actions of April 1, 1954
83rd-2nd, No. 60

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....7	Farm program.....18	Property.....12,16
Agricultural attaches...19	Forests & forestry.....5	Road authorizations.....5
Alaska.....1	Hawaii.....1	St. Lawrence Seaway.....23
Appropriations....10,15,20	Housing, farm.....8	Statehood.....1
Comptroller General.....6	Loans, farm.....4,8	Surplus commodities
Dairy industry	Marketing.....9	13,14,19
2,9,13,21,22	Personnel.....3,11,19	T.V.A.....20
Electrification.....17	Prices, support...2,13,21	Trade, foreign.....24

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed Hawaii-Alaska statehood bill. Sens. Morse and Hennings criticized flexible price supports. Senate committee voted to report Carlson personnel bill. House debated housing bill which continues farm-loan program. House committee reported Interior appropriation bill. Rep. Shelley claimed certain merchants get advance market information through USDA advisory committees.

SENATE

1. STATEHOOD. Passed, 57-28, with amendments S. 49, the Hawaii-Alaska statehood bill (pp. 4067-90). Senate conferees were appointed (p. 4090).
2. PRICE SUPPORTS. Sen. Morse criticized the Administration's price-support program and said campaign promises were not being carried out (pp. 4103-4).
Sen. Hennings criticized the reduction in dairy supports (p. 4066).
3. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee "unanimously ordered favorably reported" S. 2665, the Carlson bill which liberalizes the Classification Act of 1949 and the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 (p. D353).
4. FARM LOANS. S. 2552, to authorize the Federal land banks to make a bulk purchase of certain remaining assets of FFMC, was transferred from the Banking and Currency Committee to the Agriculture and Forestry Committee (pp. 4061-2).
5. ROAD AUTHORIZATIONS. S. 3184, to authorize appropriations for roads, including forest highways and forest roads and trails, was made the unfinished business (pp. 4061, 4090).
6. COMPTROLLER GENERAL. Sen. Kefauver commended Lindsay Warren and inserted statements commending him (pp. 4062-6).

7. ADJOURNED until Mon., Apr. 5 (p. 4107).

HOUSE

8. FARM LOANS. Began debate on H. R. 7839, the housing bill (pp. 4108-62). Reps. Deane and Jones, Ala., commended the farm-housing program, which would be continued by this bill, and Rep. Deane inserted a "statistical table summarizing rural housing loans by States" (pp. 4132, 4153-4).
9. DAIRY MARKETING. Extension of remarks of Rep. Shelley claiming that certain firms are making firm offerings for future delivery of surplus CCC dried milk to be used as livestock feed; and that these dealers "seem to have been provided with advance knowledge of plans for disposal of dried milk," and urging the Agriculture Committee to investigate this matter without delay (pp. 4164-5).
10. INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955. The Appropriations Committee reported without amendment this bill, H. R. 8680. (H. Rept. 1460) (p. 4108).
11. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee announced appointment of a subcommittee (Rep. Harden, chairman) to consider H. R. 5271, permitting payment of certain cost-of-living allowances outside the continental U. S. at rates in excess of 25% of the basic pay (p. D356).

BILLS INTRODUCED

12. SURPLUS PROPERTY. S. 3243, by Sen. Mundt, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to extend until June 30, 1955, the period during which disposals of surplus property may be made by negotiation; to Government Operations Committee (p. 4058).
13. DAIRY INDUSTRY. H. R. 8681, by Rep. Cooley, to increase the daily allowance of dairy products in the armed forces; to Armed Services Committee (p. 4166).
H. R. 8687, by Rep. Byrnes, Wis., to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 regarding price support on dairy products and disposal of surplus food; to Agriculture Committee. Remarks of author. (pp. 4162-3, 4166.)
14. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. H. R. 8689, by Rep. Heselton, "to revise section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949"; to Agriculture Committee (p. 4166).
H. R. 8688, by Rep. Hagen, Minn., to distribute surplus commodities to social-security beneficiaries; to Agriculture Committee (p. 4166).
H. Res. 489, by Rep. Berry, providing that all agricultural products, produced for emergency and wartime use and held by the Government, be declared war surplus; to Agriculture Committee (p. 4166). Remarks of author (p. A2493).

COMMITTEE HEARINGS RELEASED BY GPO

15. INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1955, Part 2. H. Appropriations Committee.

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

16. PROPERTY. Extension of remarks of Rep. Hillelson summarizing H. R. 5605, concerning transfers of certain real property within the Government (pp. A2491-2).
17. ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Abbitt inserted a Nottoway, Va., Farmers Union resolution commending REA programs (pp. A2492-3).
18. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Gillette inserted a Wallace Farmer and Iowa Homestead editorial discussing the cost of farm programs and an exchange of letters between

air pollution and excessive smoke, (b) devices, structures, machinery, equipment, and methods (including methods of selecting and using fuels) for the prevention or elimination of excessive smoke and air pollution, and (c) guidance and assistance to local communities in smoke abatement and air pollution prevention and control. Up to \$5 million would be authorized to be appropriated to carry out the research program.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be authorized to make contracts with any Federal, State, or local public agency or instrumentality, educational institution, or nonprofit agency or organization for the research and studies authorized by this section. Other general provisions necessary for the conduct of the research program would also be enacted by this section and the Secretary would be directed to disseminate the results of the research and studies in such form as may be most useful to industry and to the general public.

LOANS

Section 803 of the bill would provide for a program of Federal loans by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator in cooperation with private lending institutions to business enterprises to aid them in financing the purchase, installation, construction, reconstruction or remodeling of any smoke abatement or air pollution prevention device, structure, machinery, or equipment used or to be used in connection with the business activities of the borrower.

A loan would not be made by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator unless he determines that the purpose for which the loan is to be used would (1) substantially reduce the amount of smoke or air pollution or contamination in the community in which the device, structure, machinery, or equipment is located or to be located or (2) in conjunction with other proposed action in the community, substantially reduce the amount of such smoke pollution or contamination.

Also, the loan would not be made unless the borrower is unable to obtain such a loan from private sources on reasonable terms. Further, the section would provide that loans made may be made subject to the condition that, if at any time the business enterprise can obtain loans from other sources at interest rates as low as or lower than provided in the loan contract, it can do so with the consent of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator without waiving any rights to loan funds under the contract, and the borrower may pledge the loan contract as security for the repayment of the loan obtained from other sources. When used, this is in the nature of an insurance operation. It makes unnecessary the actual use of Federal funds. It has been used successfully in slum-clearance programs.

The loans shall be made in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate or by the purchase of participations, or otherwise. The loans made would be reasonably secured, and would be repaid within such period, not exceeding 20 years, as the Housing and Home Finance Administrator may determine. They would bear interest at a rate of not less than 1 percent plus the base annual rate specified by the Secretary of the Treasury as applicable to the 6-month period during which the contract for the loans is made. The base annual rate would be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury by estimating the average market yields during the month of May or November next preceding the 6-month period on Federal marketable bonds having a remaining maturity of 15 or more years. The present base annual rate is 2½ percent, which would, therefore, provide for an interest rate at this time on the

loans authorized by this section of 3½ percent or such higher rate as the Housing and Home Finance Administrator could establish in his discretion.

The total amount of loans made by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator pursuant to this section would not be permitted to exceed \$50 million outstanding at any one time. Funds would be authorized to be appropriated to carry out the loan program and the loan funds would revolve.

To assure national distribution of the loans the section would provide that not more than 10 percent of the funds provided shall be expended in any one State.

SPECIAL TAX BENEFITS

Section 804 would amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit for tax purposes the rapid amortization (over a period of 5 years) of devices, structures, machinery, or equipment for the prevention or elimination of air pollution. This special tax benefit would be available, however, only to the extent that the property which would be amortized at this accelerated rate was constructed, remodeled, installed, or acquired on or after the date of enactment of this section and to the extent that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare certifies that it is in aid of the prevention or elimination of air pollution.

FHA LOAN INSURANCE

Section 805 would provide that the authority of the Federal Housing Commissioner shall be used to the fullest extent possible to encourage and assist home conversion and improvement loans which would aid smoke abatement and air pollution prevention.

DEFINITION OF "STATE"

In order to make the provisions of the title applicable to all the States, Territories of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia, the word "State" as used in the title would be defined to include all of the jurisdictions named.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Provisions necessary to the administration of the title would be also enacted by this title.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to the bill (S. 3184) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916—39th United States Statutes at large, page 355—as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

At this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD a table showing an approximate apportionment of \$150 million interstate funds under the bill to be taken up on Monday, showing which States of the Nation will lose money under the new formula.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table, and, without objection, the table referred to by the Senator from New Mexico will be printed in the RECORD.

The table presented by Mr. CHAVEZ is as follows:

Approximate apportionment of \$150,000,000 interstate funds

	Sec. 21	Committee print	Difference
Alabama.....	\$3,233,000	\$3,023,000	-\$210,000
Arizona.....	2,261,000	1,682,000	-579,000
Arkansas.....	2,520,000	2,137,000	-383,000
California.....	6,977,000	8,353,000	+1,376,000
Colorado.....	2,722,000	1,970,000	-752,000
Connecticut.....	988,000	1,416,000	+428,000
Delaware.....	735,000	920,000	+185,000
Florida.....	2,464,000	2,505,000	+41,000
Georgia.....	3,749,000	3,457,000	-292,000
Idaho.....	1,863,000	1,484,000	-379,000
Illinois.....	5,852,000	6,930,000	+1,078,000
Indiana.....	3,598,000	3,607,000	+9,000
Iowa.....	3,654,000	3,031,000	-623,000
Kansas.....	3,669,000	2,709,000	-960,000
Kentucky.....	2,794,000	2,750,000	-44,000
Louisiana.....	2,364,000	2,415,000	+51,000
Maine.....	1,270,000	1,187,000	-83,000
Maryland.....	1,337,000	1,744,000	+407,000
Massachusetts.....	1,939,000	3,126,000	+1,187,000
Michigan.....	4,711,000	5,283,000	+572,000
Minnesota.....	3,926,000	3,333,000	-593,000
Mississippi.....	2,707,000	2,354,000	-353,000
Missouri.....	4,415,000	4,024,000	-391,000
Montana.....	3,034,000	2,069,000	-965,000
Nebraska.....	2,947,000	2,083,000	-864,000
Nevada.....	1,950,000	1,527,000	-423,000
New Hampshire.....	735,000	920,000	+185,000
New Jersey.....	1,974,000	3,209,000	+1,235,000
New Mexico.....	2,457,000	1,780,000	-677,000
New York.....	7,162,000	10,396,000	+3,234,000
North Carolina.....	3,757,000	3,744,000	-13,000
North Dakota.....	2,191,000	1,648,000	-543,000
Ohio.....	5,297,000	6,300,000	+1,003,000
Oklahoma.....	3,238,000	2,645,000	-593,000
Oregon.....	2,587,000	1,993,000	-594,000
Pennsylvania.....	5,970,000	7,809,000	+1,839,000
Rhode Island.....	735,000	920,000	+185,000
South Carolina.....	2,041,000	1,993,000	-48,000
South Dakota.....	2,359,000	1,732,000	-627,000
Tennessee.....	3,284,000	3,154,000	-130,000
Texas.....	9,823,000	8,456,000	-1,367,000
Utah.....	1,739,000	1,422,000	-317,000
Vermont.....	735,000	920,000	+185,000
Virginia.....	2,880,000	2,965,000	+85,000
Washington.....	2,505,000	2,345,000	-160,000
West Virginia.....	1,654,000	1,748,000	+94,000
Wisconsin.....	3,579,000	3,368,000	-211,000
Wyoming.....	1,884,000	1,494,000	-390,000
District of Columbia..	735,000	920,000	+185,000

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 8583) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FARM LOAN ACT—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on August 1 of last year the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPP] introduced a bill (S. 2552), to further amend section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, to authorize the Federal land banks to make a bulk purchase of certain remaining assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.

The bill was inadvertently referred to the Committee on the Banking and Currency. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry handles such legislation. I have talked with the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and I understand he has no objection to referring the bill to the proper committee, which is the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Reserving the right to object, will the Senator state his request again? What type of bill does he refer to?

Mr. AIKEN. It is a bill to amend section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended. It authorizes Federal land banks to make a bulk purchase of certain remaining assets of the Federal Home Mortgage Corporation. It was introduced on August 1 of last year, but was inadvertently referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency agreeable to this request?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; I have talked to him about it. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will consider the bill as soon as it obtains jurisdiction of it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Vermont? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

As in executive session.

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

Emile A. Pepin, of Rhode Island, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 5, with headquarters at Providence, R. I.;

Maynard C. Hutchinson, of Massachusetts, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 4, with headquarters at Boston, Mass.; and

Bernhard Gettelman, of Wisconsin, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 37, with headquarters at Milwaukee, Wis.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Arthur Larson, of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary of Labor.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF EDWARD B. LAWSON TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY TO ISRAEL

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Senate received today the nomination of Edward B. Lawson, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister

Plenipotentiary to Iceland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States to Israel. Notice is given that the nomination will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorial, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. SMATHERS:

Statement prepared by him on the Export-Import Bank development loans.

Article by Ansel E. Talbert, entitled "Toward an Air Merchant Marine," published in the New York Herald Tribune.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

Address delivered by Brig. Gen. Paul L. Wakefield at Fredericksburg, Tex., on March 18, 1954, on the occasion of the visit of four German parliamentarians.

Summary prepared by Arthur H. Kowert and resolution in regard to the visit of four German parliamentarians to Fredericksburg, Tex., on March 18, 1954.

Historical outline of development of Fredericksburg, Tex., prepared by William Petmecky, in connection with the visit of four German parliamentarians on March 18, 1954.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

Address entitled "How To Curb Communist Influence in Industrial Relations," delivered by Albert S. Epstein before the annual meeting of the Industrial Relations Research Association in Washington, D. C., in December 1953.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

Editorial entitled "Benson Objects to Editorial, But Facts Are Against Him," published in the Wallace Farmer and Iowa Homestead, of Des Moines, Iowa, dealing with the cost of the farm program.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

Letter in tribute to Indiana from a resident who formerly lived in Canada.

Editorial entitled "Speaking of Drinking," published in Farmers' Exchange of March 26, 1954, dealing with the underconsumption of milk.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Editorial entitled "The President's Trade Policy," published in the New York Times of March 31, 1954.

Article entitled "For a United Western Policy in Asia," written by Anne O'Hare McCormick, and published in the New York Times of March 31, 1954.

By Mr. THYE:

Letter addressed to him by Thruston B. Morton, Assistant Secretary of State, relating to an editorial from the April 1954 Farm Journal entitled "Farmers and the State Department," dealing with disposal of surplus agricultural commodities.

Article entitled "Tomorrow's Cost of Today's Ill Housed," written by Malvina Lindsay, and published in the Washington Post and Times-Herald of April 1, 1954.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Editorial entitled "Secretary Benson at Cornell," published in the Watertown (N. Y.) Daily Times of March 25, 1954, dealing with the current reduction of price supports for dairy products.

LINDSAY C. WARREN

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I know that all Members of Congress read with regret the news that Lindsay Warren, Comptroller General of the United States, will retire on April 30, before the

expiration of his term, which would not end until more than a year and one-half later. All of us regret very much, indeed, that poor health forces Mr. Warren to retire.

Mr. President, many of the Members of the Senate had the privilege of serving in the House of Representatives with Mr. Warren, where he was a Member for 16 years. He was appointed Comptroller General of the United States in 1940.

Mr. Warren was a legislator of great ability. He possessed an unusual faculty for conciliating differences, and while a Member of the House of Representatives he was responsible for the passage of a great many pieces of forward-looking, progressive legislation. As Comptroller General he converted this important office from a state of chaos into an efficient, worth-while agency of the Federal Government which has rendered much good service.

Mr. Warren is a public servant of the highest order. He always called the facts as he saw them, without regard to partisan considerations. He leaves this post with the thanks of the American people for a job well done and with the high esteem of thousands who have been privileged to know him throughout the years.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, Hon. Lindsay C. Warren will retire on April 30, 1954, as Comptroller General of the United States. He has served in this position for 13½ years. I do not know any man in any official position anywhere or at any time who has rendered more dedicated public service than Lindsay Warren, nor one who has exhibited more real ability and genuine devotion to duty. His record has brought unusual distinction to himself and great credit to his native State of North Carolina, which he represented in Congress from the First District of North Carolina for many years and achieved national reputation.

Mr. Warren has been a warm personal friend of mine over the years. I have always esteemed him most highly. The people of North Carolina have real admiration and affection for him. His administration has resulted in the saving of millions of dollars to the taxpayers of the United States. His foresight and judgment has enabled the Congress to keep fully advised as to many vitally important matters which would have escaped their notice but for his vigilance and diligence. He has given an example to other Government agencies by demonstrating how his own great department could save money in its administration and at the same time increase its efficiency and broaden its base of operations.

In this connection, I wish to thank my good friend the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] for the fine tribute he has paid to Mr. Warren.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD a letter which Mr. Warren addressed to the President of the United States under date of March 29, 1954, and the reply of President Eisenhower to this letter dated March 31, 1954.

Is there any reason to suppose that future historians would be any kinder in their judgment of us, where we of this Congress to reject Alaska and Hawaii?

Is not ours the privilege of determining whether future generations will look back upon us as men of vision, or as men who were singularly lacking in this quality?

Shall they respect us as we now do the memories of the statesmen who shared the foresight of Jefferson? Or will we earn for ourselves the ignominy which would have been theirs had they rejected the Louisiana Purchase?

The bright lamp of history clearly illumines both paths. It is for us to choose which we shall take.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, first, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H. R. 3575, the House bill on statehood for Hawaii.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from California?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, what was the request?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I asked unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H. R. 3575, the House bill providing for statehood for Hawaii. If that request be granted, I shall then ask that the language of the Senate bill be substituted for the language of the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. EASTLAND. I object.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I shall not take much of the time of the Senate at this late hour. However, I think these facts should be placed in the RECORD.

So far as Hawaii is concerned, the Territory has been an incorporated part of the United States for more than half a century. Its population of 500,000 is larger than that of four of our present States, namely, Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, and Nevada.

Since its incorporation as a Territory, Hawaii has paid more than \$1,650,000,000 in Federal taxes.

Pearl Harbor showed that our western front for defense purposes was no longer the west coast.

The party platforms of both major parties called for statehood in 1952, and have repeatedly endorsed such statehood in prior conventions.

The most recent Gallup poll, taken in January 1953, showed that 78 percent of the public favor admission of Hawaii to statehood; 8 percent were opposed; and 14 percent had no opinion.

The vast majority of the people of Hawaii, according to numerous polls, and the vast majority of the people of the United States, want Hawaii as the 49th State.

According to the 1950 census, 84 percent of the population of Hawaii are native-born American citizens, and 99.2 percent of all its school children are native-born Americans.

The percentage of Hawaii's battle casualties in Korea was three times that of the United States.

In World War II, one battalion from Hawaii has been described as the most decorated unit in the entire history of the United States.

During World War II, according to Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Chief of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, not a single case of sabotage by a Hawaiian civilian was reported.

Because of the progress which has been made in the fields of transportation and communication, Hawaii, for all purposes, is closer to the Nation's Capital today than were many of the Original Thirteen States.

Among all the present 48 States, only Oklahoma had a larger population when it was admitted into the Union.

The present and past Congresses have held 11 congressional hearings on the subject of statehood for Hawaii.

So far as Alaska is concerned, while its population is smaller than that of Hawaii, and while I have been frank to admit that I believe statehood for Hawaii has priority in consideration, the question before the Senate today is that if Senators believe in statehood for either Hawaii or Alaska, or for both, the only way in which to grant statehood is to pass the bill which is now before the Senate. Otherwise, statehood will be dead, so far as this session of the Congress of the United States is concerned.

Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time. I recognize that the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], who objected earlier, was within his rights to do so. However, I wish to call attention to the fact—

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will yield in a moment.

Mr. EASTLAND. I merely wish to withdraw my objection.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, the unanimous-consent request I made was that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H. R. 3575, the House bill providing for statehood for Hawaii. If the unanimous-consent request should be granted, I would then ask unanimous consent that all after the enacting clause of the House bill be stricken, and that the language of the Senate bill, S. 49, be substituted therefor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

Mr. ELLENDER. I object.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield at that point?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall be glad to yield, if I have any time remaining.

Mr. ANDERSON. The majority leader recognizes, I assume, that a motion could be filed to accomplish what he has just requested. It will tie up the Senate a little longer, but it is possible to obtain the action in that way, if the distinguished majority leader desires to proceed in that way. That practice is followed day after day on other types of legislation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I had hoped that for the convenience of many Senators it would be possible for the Senate to conclude its session for today very soon. We have gone through a long debate. Two whole days have elapsed since the unanimous-consent agreement was entered into. My proposal will merely require a couple of extra moves.

Under the unanimous-consent request, I shall move to discharge the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Then I shall have to move to adjourn the Senate for a brief period of time, so that we may proceed in another legislative day. The process will be cumbersome. It will mean that the Senate probably will not be able to adjourn for several hours. But the procedure is not an unusual one.

I submit that in the general comity of our relationships in the Senate, it is the customary and reasonable practice, when the House has passed a bill on a subject, and the Senate has acted on a similar bill of its own, to prepare the measure for conference by following the course I have suggested. That is the orderly procedure of the Senate. But if it is necessary to do it the hard way, we shall simply have to do it the hard way.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, there have been three speeches from the majority side; one from the majority leader, who has stated that he is in favor of the bill, one from the chairman of the Republican policy committee, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who has stated he is against it, and a third speech from the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the distinguished and able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] who has stated he is likewise against the bill because Alaska has been attached to the Hawaiian statehood bill. It is obvious, therefore, that this is not a partisan issue.

I think it is important for the Senate to have an opportunity to study the bill further.

I think throughout the debate we have demonstrated that there is no moral or legal obligation to grant statehood to either Territory. We also have pointed out, indisputably, that the question is a matter to be decided by the Congress whenever it wishes to decide it. I think we have been able to show that Alaska and Hawaii will be infinitely better off by granting them commonwealth status enabling each to attain a maximum degree of self government under the jurisdiction of the United States.

Once we admit as new States Territories beyond our contiguous land mass we will have shattered a well-established precedent, the effects of which no one can foresee. If we can reach out into the Pacific Ocean some 2,000 miles and make a Territory a State, if we can go up into the Bering Sea and the Arctic Ocean and take in another Territory as a State, how can we logically deny state-

hood to other noncontiguous areas throughout the world?

I think the bill should go back to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for further study.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me for a moment?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I renew my request, Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of H. R. 3575, to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, which is the House bill on Hawaiian statehood. If that request shall be granted, I shall immediately ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 3575, that all after the enacting clause be stricken out, and that the language of Senate bill 49, as amended, be substituted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the first request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Now, Mr. President, I make the second request, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 3575, and that all after the enacting clause be stricken out, and that Senate bill 49, as amended, be substituted for the House bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the second request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, with the minority leader, I am prepared to yield the remainder of my time to the Chair and have a vote at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. KNOWLAND and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays, and the yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

On this vote the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is paired with the

Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] would vote "nay."

If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

I announce also that on this vote the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea."

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea," and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 28, as follows.

YEAS—57

Aiken	Ewart	Long
Anderson	Gillette	Magnuson
Barrett	Goldwater	Mansfield
Beall	Green	Millikin
Bennett	Griswold	Morse
Burke	Hayden	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Hendrickson	Murray
Capehart	Hennings	Neely
Carlson	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Case	Holland	Payne
Chavez	Hunt	Potter
Clements	Jackson	Purtell
Cooper	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kilgore	Symington
Douglas	Knowland	Thye
Duff	Kuchel	Upton
Dworshak	Langer	Watkins
Flanders	Lehman	Williams

NAYS—28

Bricker	Hoey	Monroney
Bush	Ives	Robertson
Butler, Md.	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Eastland	Kerr	Smathers
Ellender	Malone	Stennis
Ferguson	Maybank	Welker
Fulbright	McCarran	
Hill	McClellan	

NOT VOTING—11

Bridges	Kennedy	Sparkman
George	Lennon	Wiley
Gore	Martin	Young
Humphrey	McCarthy	

So the bill (H. R. 3575) was passed.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the

Senator from California to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to enable the people of Hawaii and Alaska each to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States."

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. CORDON, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. ANDERSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS TO CONTINUE THE CONSTRUCTION OF HIGHWAYS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 3184, Calendar 1092, to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

This is the so-called highway bill, regarding which I have previously made announcement. It is not intended to have the Senate proceed to debate the bill at this time; the purpose is to have the bill made the unfinished business.

If the bill is now made the unfinished business, it is my purpose to have Senators then be given an opportunity to make insertions in the Record or make speeches or submit various matters; and then to have the Senate take an adjournment until Monday next, at 12 o'clock noon, at which time there will be a call of the calendar of bills and other measures to which there is no objection, following which debate on the highway bill will commence.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3184) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of its business today the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

Mr. MORSE. I did not hear the majority leader's request.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The request is that when the Senate completes its business

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued April 6, 1954
For actions of April 5, 1954
83rd-2nd, No. 62

CONTENTS

Accounting.....26	Food distribution.....23	Pesticide chemicals.....1
Alaska.....29	Food standards.....13	Price supports....16,30,32
Appropriations.....6,7	Hawaii.....29	Reclamation.....7
Civil defense.....5	Health.....31	Research.....3,12
Crime investigations....15	Housing, farm.....24	Road authorizations..10,33
Crop insurance.....21	Incentive awards.....4	Statehood.....29
Dairy industry and trade 16,23,30	Labor, farm.....6	Sugar.....8,11
Disbursing.....14	Lands, transfer.....12	Trade, foreign..9,18,25,28
Electrification.....7,27	Legislative program....19	Tuna imports.....9
Farm policy.....17	Loans, farm.....2,20	Tung oil.....28
	Personnel.....4,22	

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed bills to: Authorize land banks to purchase FFMC assets; liberalize plant patenting law; regulate pesticide chemicals on food; establish single incentive-awards program. House debated Interior appropriation bill. House agreed to conference report on Mexican farm-labor appropriation measure. Rep. Willis urged increased mainland cane-sugar quota. Senate debated road-authorization bill. Sen. Aiken introduced bills on emergency farm loans, crop-insurance financing, and tenant-loan encouragement. Senate passed bills to: Authorize Attorney General to conduct certain crime investigations; remove limitations on Miles City research-land transfer. Sen. Ellender recommended increased mainland cane-sugar quota.

HOUSE

1. PESTICIDE CHEMICALS. Passed as reported H. R. 7125, to prohibit the use of pesticide chemicals as additives to raw agricultural commodities unless the quantity does not exceed the limits of tolerance as established by HEW or is exempted from the requirement of tolerance by the Secretary of HEW, and to provide for regulations for classifications of pesticide chemicals according to the degree of tolerance, etc. (pp. 4334-6).

2. FARM LOANS. Passed without amendment H. R. 6711, to further amend section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act so as to authorize the Federal land banks to make a bulk purchase of certain remaining assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation (pp. 4336-7).

Received from this Department a proposed bill to eliminate the requirement that economic disaster loans be restricted to areas designated by the President and to make additional funds available for economic emergency loans; to Agriculture Committee (p. 4370).

3. RESEARCH. Passed as reported H. R. 5420, which provides that whoever invents or discovers and asexually reproduces any distinct and new variety of plant, including cultivated sports, mutants, hybrids, and newly found seedlings (other

than a tuberpropagated plant or a plant found in an uncultivated state) may obtain a patent therefor under the Plant Patent Act (p. 4337).

Passed without amendment S. 1456, to authorize the Gorgas Memorial Institute to accept funds from Latin American governments for its maintenance (p. 4332). This bill will now be sent to the President.

4. PERSONNEL. Passed with amendments H. R. 7774, the proposed "Federal Employees Incentive Awards Act of 1954" (pp. 4328-31). The bill provides as follows: Imposes a duty on each administrator to establish an incentive awards program for his department or agency in accordance with standards and regulations of the Civil Service Commission. Places the responsibility on the Commission to inspect these programs and to request the administrator to revise or modify his plan if necessary. Authorizes the Commission to establish an incentive awards office, appoint a director thereof, and delegate to him whatever duties it deems necessary. Establishes the line of administrative authority from the director of the incentive awards office directly to the Executive Director of the Commission. Authorizes departments to pay cash awards and expenses for honorary recognition from their general appropriations; and permits a number of different departments who have all benefited from a single suggestion to share in the award granted therefor. Places a limitation of \$5,000 on an individual cash award which an administrator can grant under his own authority, but permits such awards up to \$25,000 if approved by the Commission. Authorizes the President to pay additional cash awards and incur expenses for honorary recognition if a suggestion or invention is of a highly meritorious or exceptional nature. States that due weight shall be given to awards in considering employees for promotion. Repeals all existing laws governing incentive-awards programs. Establishes the effective date of the bill as 90 days after its enactment.

Rep. Hagen, subcommittee chairman, stated: "I want to emphasize at this point that section 3 (a) of this bill will permit departments and agencies to continue the practice of granting length-of-service awards for longevity as is presently done under authority of Public Law 600 of the 79th Congress" (p.4329).

5. CIVIL DEFENSE. Passed without amendment H. R. 7308, to repeal Sec. 307 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 which provides for termination of title III (emergency authority) on June 30, 1954 (p. 4328).
6. FARM LABOR. Agreed to the conference report on H. J. Res. 461, appropriating \$478,000 additional to the Labor Department for the Mexican farm labor program (p. 4324).
7. INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955. Began debate on this bill, H. R. 8680 (pp. 4340-61). A considerable portion of the debate was on reclamation and electrification items.
8. SUGAR. Rep. Willis urged an increase in the quota of the mainland cane sugar area from 500,000 to 600,000 tons of raw sugar (pp. 4368-70).
9. TUNA IMPORTS. Rep. King, Calif., urged increased restrictions on tuna imports (pp. 4361-2).

SENATE

10. ROAD AUTHORIZATIONS. Began debate on S. 3184, to authorize road appropriations for the fiscal years 1956 and 1957 (pp. 4310-2).
11. SUGAR. Sen. Ellender spoke in favor of his bill, S. 3019, to increase the domestic sugarcane quota by 100,000 tons (pp. 4318-9).

Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Bush] to this announcement.

Following that bill, I hope to have the Senate take up Senate bill 2713, Calendar 1082, authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to reconvey certain property which the city of Boulder, Colo., donated to the Secretary of Commerce for the establishment of a radio propagation laboratory.

Following that bill, I hope to have the Senate take up Senate bill 2874, Calendar 1134, to provide that title to certain school lands shall vest in the States under the act of January 25, 1927, notwithstanding any Federal leases which may be outstanding on such lands at the time they are surveyed.

I do not believe the consideration of those bills will require a great deal of time.

The next major bill will be House bill 6342, Calendar 1085, to amend the Public Building Act of 1949 to authorize the Administrator of General Services to acquire title to real property and to provide for the construction of certain public buildings thereon by executing purchase contracts; to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to lease quarters for post-office purposes; and for other purposes. I have previously made an announcement regarding that bill.

Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Iowa for permitting me to make this announcement at this time.

THE WAR IN INDOCHINA AND THE IMPENDING CONFERENCE AT GENEVA

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I rise to speak briefly on the war in Indochina and the impending conference at Geneva.

This is a time for plain speaking, and for a frank, honest, and earnest search for the best possible course for America to follow.

Even though not a single American may have fired a shot, or been fired on, in the war in Indochina, America is deeply, dangerously, and perhaps inextricably involved in this area. Our involvement grows greater as the struggle reaches the point of extreme crisis.

A narrow set of ugly choices has been presented to us. In simplest terms, the alternatives in Indochina have been reduced to three: Appear, fight, or quit—purchase peace from the Communists, or make war against the Communists, or abandon Southeast Asia to the Communists.

The first alternative is to pay the price that Communist China demands for stopping aid to the Indochinese Viet Minh forces. The French themselves do not have the power to pay this price. Only the United States can pay it. The price is recognition of the Peiping regime and its admission to the United Nations. Secretary Dulles has echoed the prevailing sentiment of the Congress and of the American people in flatly opposing any settlement of the Indochina conflict which would require our yielding to these demands.

Mr. President, this morning the eminent Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, told the House Foreign Affairs

Committee that the Chinese Communists are "coming awfully close" to aggression in Indochina which might call for retaliation against the Chinese mainland. The Secretary of State did not specify what nation or nations might carry the war to the Chinese mainland, but earlier he said the Communist threat to southeast Asia must be met by unity of will and if need be, unity of action.

The second alternative is for America to enter the war on the side of the French and their Vietnam associates to prevent Communist conquest. Secretary Dulles, fully supported by the President, has in effect served notice that the United States will fight, if necessary, to prevent Indochina from falling into Communist hands. The President has refused to close the door completely to possible use of American forces in Indochina, and he has endorsed the declaration of the Secretary of State that the whole free community should take united action to prevent Communist conquest of Indochina. While the precise meaning of this declaration has not been made clear, a reasonable interpretation is that it is a commitment to go to war if necessary.

The third alternative would be our acceptance of French withdrawal from Indochina on whatever terms they can extract from Ho Chi Minh and, hence, our acceptance of loss of the entire region to the Communists.

This is the road the French would have to take if the United States should refuse to choose either of the other alternatives: political concessions to purchase peace or active intervention to fight on the French side.

The French people are weary of this long and bitter conflict—far wearier than we Americans were after 3 years of Korea. Their men have fought bravely, their best young officers have been decimated, their political concessions to the Indochinese have been too few and too late, and now they no longer believe the war can be won in a military sense. They argue that just as America sought and secured a truce in Korea, so now France must seek and secure one in Indochina.

If and when the French delegates return from the Geneva conference to Paris without having secured a settlement of the Indochina war through United States-Chinese negotiation, the present French Government will probably give way to a new government able and willing to deal directly with the Communist Vietminh for an end to hostilities on whatever terms possible.

A truce reached between France and the Vietminh would be but a brief prelude to complete communization of Vietnam, followed by absorption of the weaker neighbor states of Cambodia and Laos into the Communist empire.

Furthermore, a French Government able to negotiate with the Reds in Indochina would unquestionably have the support of the French Communist Party. Such a government might even include Communist participation. Thus a major Communist objective in France would be achieved. Such a drastic change in

the French political scene could cause a most dangerous cleavage in France and even bring about violent counteraction prompted by elements in the Army and by interests which stand to lose greatly if the Reds take over Indochina. Civil anarchy in France could have disastrous effects on the entire Atlantic alliance.

When we examine the narrow range of choice, we see how foolish it is to utter empty phrases about our having seized the initiative in the cold war. The alternatives before us are scarcely those to which far-seeing statesmen would willingly have sought to limit themselves.

The question remains: are these the only remaining alternatives—appeasement, another war in Asia, or capitulation and abandonment?

The range of choice offered us is so limited because our whole approach to the crisis in Indochina is based on a misconception. We refuse to regard the struggle in Indochina as anything but a military problem, or primarily a military problem. If, indeed, it is nothing but a military problem, that is because of a failure to solve the political problem. Soldiers are paying for the failures of statesmen, as so often happens.

The Communists do not regard it as merely a military struggle. Their military operations are for the purpose of political advantage, harassment, and pressure. They do not expect to win by military victory. They do not believe they will have to. They expect to win by the exhaustion, defeatism, and ultimate withdrawal of the French on one hand, and by the apathy, despair, and war weariness of the peoples of Indochina on the other.

But why is there war in Indochina and why has this war been going on for almost 8 years? Just because a Communist force called the Vietminh is attempting to capture control of Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos? Just because Communist China is supplying arms to the Vietminh to drive the French from Indochina? Just because the French are resisting this attempt to expand communism and expel them from Asia? No, Mr. President, these are not the original causes of this conflict, but rather the causes of its prolongation.

There is war in Indochina because of nationalism, because of the passionate desire and determination of the people to be rid of foreign rule and to govern themselves without interference from any outside source, and because of French refusal to grant independence in time and to the degree the Indochinese demand. The Communists have largely succeeded in monopolizing the nationalist movement and in identifying themselves with the nationalist sentiment. The Communists did not do this by offering communism or mentioning collective farms, slave labor, secret police, and all the other horrors of Communist rule. They have done it by offering national freedom.

For the United States, and for the rest of the free world, the problem is how to win the peoples of Indochina away from the Communists and away from the

apathy and despair that have resulted from this bloody struggle in their homeland.

How can we do this? Have we time to do it? Arming the French and sending military technicians and B-26 bombers may prevent further Communist military success in the immediate emergency. I pray that they will do so. Every American's sympathy is with the brave French forces fighting in the inferno of Dien Bien Phu. But military missions and bombers do not touch the central political issue; and the issue in Indochina is political. The root of it is nationalism—the demand of the people for freedom and independence.

If we shake loose our obsession with military measures and seek to win the political struggle in Indochina, the range of choice before us is not as narrow as we have been told.

There are two steps which I believe we can take as part of a program of political warfare, as distinct from military measures in Indochina. The purpose of this program would be to win the peoples of Indochina to the side of the community of free nations and to win the support of the millions throughout Asia and the rest of the world who believe that America has some selfish, ulterior purpose in going to the aid of the French.

If this is not done, I think the American people themselves will be left in doubt as to the justification for the sacrifices which armed intervention in Indochina would require from them.

Mr. President, I offer these two suggestions in no spirit of partisanship, but because I believe there are ways to deal with the emergency in Indochina other than those submitted to us. I believe they offer greater promise of success in winning Indochina for the free world than any other alternatives so far proposed.

If we declare our support for complete independence for the peoples of Indochina, and act on that declaration, and if we bring the aggression in Indochina before the United Nations, as the threat to world peace and security we all know it is, then we can stand before the world as champions of freedom and of peace, and no man will dare challenge our right to the title.

Let us do these things before the Geneva Conference, before our French allies face the impossible condition of diplomatic stalemate on top of military stalemate, and before they give up the struggle in Indochina leaving nothing to replace their strength.

Here is a way to seize the initiative. If we seize it, we have a chance to win political victory where military victory has eluded the French for 8 years. If we are accused of meddling in another's affairs, the answer is that it is our affair too, and that at France's urgent request we are demonstrating it with tangible evidence of money, arms, military missions, and overwhelming public concern.

Let us face these facts. In the long run we will be thanked for having done so, even by those who in the short run may feel their interests have been hurt. If we are denounced by those who still believe in colonial imperialism, then let

us be proud to have earned their reproach, for in having earned it we shall also have won back. I believe, the confidence and faith in the purity of our intentions among countless millions throughout the world who regard the United States of America as the champion of colonial freedom.

The people of Indochina do not want communism, but they will take even communism in preference to dying slowly in a war for a cause they do not regard as their own. Their cause is freedom. That must be our cause too.

If the administration wants to demonstrate true initiative against the Communists, then it must seize this last remaining opportunity before Geneva to offer the peoples of Indochina what they want, to offer the French an honorable way out of their tragic dilemma, and to raise before the peoples of the entire free world a banner to which they can enthusiastically repair.

We have the means, we have the faith, we still have the time. Four weeks from now it may be too late.

First, let us return to a great American tradition: the tradition of support for colonial peoples struggling against empires for their liberty. Let us do, at once, whatever is necessary to make it unmistakably plain that America is on the side of the peoples of Indochina for the sake of their independence as well as of our security. I am aware that for years we have urged the French to grant greater freedom for the Indochinese, but do the Indochinese know this? And does the rest of the world know it? Let us now do these things:

Demonstrate in the frankest and clearest language possible that we want Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos to be completely free and independent nations;

Send United States ambassadors to each of these 3 governments, in place of the 1 who is now assigned to all 3;

Negotiate directly with these governments agreements of mutual defense designed to aid in securing them independence from all forms of colonialism and imperialism, old or new, from whatever source;

Send military, economic, and technical assistance to these three governments directly rather than, as we are now doing, except for \$25 million economic aid, through the French budget.

There is no doubt whatever that the American people favor freedom and independence for the peoples of Indochina. Now is the time to demonstrate that fact by deeds and by words. There is very little time left.

The other step in the alternative approach I propose is to bring the war in Indochina before the United Nations.

If, as we believe, this war is a clear and present danger to the peace and security of the world, then it must be brought before the United Nations.

In Korea the moral position of the United States was unassailable, because United Nations observers were on the scene to report the North Korean invasion. The United Nations did not have to accept our word for it because its own impartial observers were on the spot. There should be U. N. observers on or

near the frontier between China and Indochina. Let the Communists explain their refusal to allow the U. N. to know what is going on.

If the Indochina crisis is not brought before the United Nations, on what legal or moral grounds can the United States base any decision to intervene in force or to urge our associates in the free world to join in united action to prevent Communist conquest? On what grounds would these associates base their acceptance of our proposals?

If this is not done, it will be extremely difficult to convince the doubting nations of much of the world that we are not merely trying to bolster colonial rule in Indochina or to convince them that what is happening is really Chinese aggression against her neighbors.

CONSTRUCTION OF HIGHWAYS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3184) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I should like to speak briefly on the pending bill, S. 3184, the highway bill.

After many hearings and after a great deal of work in considering the various bills which had been submitted, the Committee on Public Works believes that the bill as reported is probably the best that could be enacted for the benefit of the United States at the present time.

Mr. President, Federal responsibility for the development of a national highway system for military and commercial purposes was recognized at the very beginning of our history as a nation.

George Washington, as we know, was a surveyor and an engineer. He was one of the first advocates of a great highway to provide communication between the East and the West.

The first step in that direction was taken in 1806 when Congress authorized the construction of the National Pike. This became the principal route for the tremendous overland transportation that contributed so much to the settlement and economic development of the West. It is now part of the heavily traveled U. S. Route 40.

Regardless of the vast progress made by other systems of transportation and the expansion of traffic on our canals, rivers, railroads, and in the air, the public roads continue to be the basic system of transportation in our country. They are vital factors in military and peacetime service. To a large extent public roads have carried the lifeblood of American progress.

In the matter of highway development, we find a situation that is different from other forms of transportation. The cost of our free highways has always been met out of taxes, paid by the public.

So that today, with the tremendous demand for relief from the congestion, delays, and dangers of an inadequate highway system, the most serious prob-

lem confronting us is how to get the money.

I recognize the fact that those of us in Government who are cost conscious and economy minded are faced with a tremendous problem.

It is our job and our responsibility to balance the unquestioned need for highway development adequate to meet the present and future traffic requirements with the constantly climbing costs and the ever-increasing burden on the taxpayer.

The public demand for efficient and rapid motor transportation over better and safer highways was never more clearly indicated or more thoroughly justified.

At the same time there is an equally strong demand for government at lower cost and sound fiscal policies that will take away some of the double pressure of high prices and high taxes.

We are all aware that the rapid expansion of motor transportation has been one of the most spectacular facts of our century.

Statistics compiled by competent authorities present a revealing picture of the highway situation.

In 1945, according to statistics I believe to be accurate, there were 5 million trucks on our highways. In 1952 there were 9 million—an increase of 90 percent.

Ton-miles of motortruck transportation in 1945 totaled 55 billion—today the total is 115 billion—an increase of 108 percent.

Today we have about 55 million passenger cars on our streets and highways, and about 200,000 buses in operation.

More than 3 million new vehicles are placed on the highways every year in excess of those that are scrapped.

In face of that tremendous traffic demand it has been brought out that nearly two-thirds of our Federal-aid highway system, or 435,000 miles, do not give satisfactory service. The cost of improvements to bring them up to present day traffic needs has been estimated at \$37 billion.

It is important to note that at least 23 States have enacted some type of toll road legislation and it is expected that about 2,000 miles of toll highways will be in operation in the country within the next 2 years.

In that connection it has been stated by authorities, who I feel, are entirely competent that only 8,000 miles of self-liquidating toll roads can be built in our country today, in accordance with the present population.

For that reason extreme care should be used in the planning of toll roads and they should be authorized only after thorough study.

The toll roads of the various States should be coordinated as much as possible through the Federal Bureau of Public Roads.

We are now giving much consideration to civilian defense. Three or four years ago we were talking of spending billions of dollars for underground safety factors in civilian defense. It is now recognized that provision for rapid dispersal from heavily populated areas is

extremely important in civil defense planning. I believe there will be no greater help along this line than an adequate system of interstate and urban roads. I believe they will provide the best defense against any attack on civilian population.

Mr. President, there is another point to which I would like to call the attention of the Senate. It is the fact that when we consider the depreciation in the value of the dollar we will be unable to build more miles of highways with the proposed increased authorizations than we did with the smaller appropriations of 15 years ago.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, this bill marks a milestone in the highway history of the United States. For the first time in our history, it proposes to apply to the building of highways as much money as is collected in taxes on motor fuels. For the first time, if this bill becomes law, the Federal-Aid Highway Act will carry a billion dollars per year for highways.

This bill, Mr. President, represents an awakening conscience on the part of America. Last year, 38,000 people lost

their lives and 1,350,000 people were injured in highway accidents. This bill speaks our determination to provide safer highways and to cut down on that terrible toll of lives, property, and human happiness.

Compared with present law, the bill provides \$910 million annually for the Federal-aid systems against \$575 million today. For roads on Federal lands, the bill provides \$90 million against \$77,500,000 authorized in present law.

Compared with the bill passed by the House of Representatives, this bill proposes a total of \$110 million more for the Federal-aid systems and \$15 million more for the Federal land roads—forests, parks, and Indian lands.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a brief table showing the distribution of the amounts proposed for the interstate system, forest highways, forest development roads and trails, park roads, parkways, Indian roads, and public lands.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Federal-aid systems	Present law	House bill (H. R. 8127)	Senate (S. 3184)
Federal primary system (45 percent).....	\$247, 500, 000	\$270, 000, 000	\$342, 000, 000
Federal secondary system (30 percent).....	165, 000, 000	180, 000, 000	228, 000, 000
Urban system (25 percent).....	137, 500, 000	150, 000, 000	190, 000, 000
Subtotal, above aid programs.....	550, 000, 000	600, 000, 000	760, 000, 000
Interstate system (matched 60-40).....	25, 000, 000	200, 000, 000	150, 000, 000
Forest highways (often matched).....	22, 500, 000	22, 500, 000	25, 000, 000
Forest-development roads and trails.....	22, 500, 000	22, 500, 000	25, 000, 000
Park roads (largely maintenance).....	10, 000, 000	10, 000, 000	12, 500, 000
Parkways (special authorizations).....	10, 000, 000	10, 000, 000	12, 500, 000
Indian roads (construction and maintenance).....	10, 000, 000	10, 000, 000	12, 500, 000
Public lands.....	2, 500, 000	-----	2, 500, 000
Total for roads in the United States.....	652, 500, 000	875, 000, 000	1, 002, 000, 000

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the total collections of Federal excise taxes on gasoline, diesel fuel, and lubricating oils in 1953 amounted to approximately \$979 million. They have been increasing at the rate of from 5 to 10 percent a year. So, it is believed that for the fiscal years of 1956 and 1957, for which this bill provides, the receipts will pass the billion dollar mark.

For years, the Federal Government has been preaching to the States against diversion of gas tax receipts; penalizing them in fact if they did spend revenues from gasoline taxes on nonhighway purposes. By this act which proposes to make available for highway purposes an amount equal to the receipts from special taxes on motor fuels, we are beginning to practice what we preach—and doing so without setting any precedents for actual earmarking of tax receipts.

This bill is noteworthy, Mr. President, in several other respects. Among them may be noted:

First. The great increase for the interstate system—making it sixfold what it now is, as will be seen by reference to the table above.

Second. Greater leeway for States to design their secondary systems with consequent saving in Federal administration and more miles of secondary roads built.

Third. Authority for the President to advance the effective date for any fund

by as much as 1 year if economic conditions suggest that.

Fourth. Matching on the interstate system on a 60-40 basis to offset higher costs and to encourage States to use it fully in their matching.

Fifth. Provisions for thorough studies on safety design, financing, research on materials and the problem of costs in utility relocations.

In presenting this bill to the Senate, Mr. President, we believe we offer a sound program of domestic public works which will carry benefits to every section of our country. The dollars spent under this bill will be a permanent investment in America yielding both public and private income for all time to come.

At this time, Mr. President, I wish to express a personal word of appreciation to the several members of the Committee on Public Works, who are members of the Subcommittee on Roads—in fact, I include every member of the committee—because of the splendid attendance they gave during the hearings on the bill and during the time we were marking up the bill.

I wish to express particular appreciation for the leadership of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the chairman of the Committee on Public Works. His long experience in public life, and particularly as Governor of the State of Pennsylvania, his intimate acquaintance with the difficult highway

problems which present themselves in a State of the size, varied terrain, large population, and the heavy flow of traffic of Pennsylvania, enabled him to give most valuable leadership and counsel in preparing this bill.

I do not care to go into further details with reference to the bill today. I suggest that Members of the Senate will find the report of the committee, which has been prepared by the staff, of immense help to them. Several tables are embraced in the report which will answer many questions. I hope to resume the debate personally sometime tomorrow, and to give further particulars regarding the details of the bill at that time.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I should like to have the Senator from South Dakota answer a question or two with reference to the bill. The first question is this: As I understand the bill, approximately \$850,000,000 will be apportioned among the States according to the old formula. Is that correct?

Mr. CASE. The sum of \$760,000,000 will be apportioned for the Federal primary system, the Federal secondary system, and the urban system, under the old formula. Of the \$150,000,000 for the interstate system, one-half will be apportioned under the old formula and one-half on a basis of the ratio of population.

Mr. BARRETT. The Senator is correct, because the forest highways are built entirely with Federal funds, and, consequently, there is no question of apportionment involved in the case of such roads.

Mr. CASE. There is no question of apportionment in connection with forest roads. In some instances, however, States cooperate by voluntary matching.

Mr. BARRETT. And by maintenance.

Mr. CASE. Yes.

Mr. BARRETT. The sum and substance of the change in the formula resolves itself down to \$75 million, or one-half of the \$150 million allocated for the interstate system. Is that correct?

Mr. CASE. That is correct. I may say to the Senator from Wyoming that, personally, I should like to have had it based on the old formula, but I must recognize that there is a great deal of justice in allocating to the interstate system according to the needs and the costs involved in completing the system. The Senator will note that the amount proposed for the interstate system is \$150 million, which is 6 times the amount authorized under the present law.

The House of Representatives proposed \$200 million, which would be 8 times the amount provided by existing law. Both figures represent a growing conviction that, from the standpoint of national need, it is important to complete the interstate system; hence the very large increase in the amount proposed. Since the increase is based upon that consideration, there is some justice in saying that the apportionment should be reflected in areas having the greatest

need and confronted with the greatest cost.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I wish to congratulate the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Pennsylvania, and their colleagues on the committee, for the splendid bill which they have reported to the Senate for consideration.

I am particularly interested in the funds allocated or authorized for forest highways, forest roads, and trails, and park roads and trails under the jurisdiction of the Park Service. It seems to me that an effort has at last been made to obtain sufficient funds to bring the roads on federally owned lands up to a par with the roads of the primary system, with which they are very important links.

Mr. CASE. That is correct. Of course, as the Senator knows, in many instances a primary road goes through a national forest. Unless the roads on the federally owned land are up to the same standard as the primary road, it shows off Uncle Sam to rather poor advantage. When one leaves a portion of a road which has been built with State aid to a high standard and comes to a section which passes through a forest, and finds the forest section is below the standard of the State-built highway, it appears as though Uncle Sam has not taken care of his own property as well as the State has taken care of its property.

Mr. BARRETT. So far as my State of Wyoming is concerned, the forest highways are in deplorable shape as compared with the other roads in the State. It seems to me that what is most needed is action with respect to the forest highways.

Mr. CASE. The committee was impressed by a statement made by a representative of the Forest Service who appeared before us, to the effect that in 1 year, either 1951 or 1952, the Federal Government lost \$20 million through the inability to sell timber from national forests, simply because there was not a highway or a road which would permit logging crews to get to the timber.

Mr. BARRETT. That is precisely the case in one section of Wyoming at present.

I have one other question I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from South Dakota. Am I correct in understanding that funds authorized for the primary system and for the interstate system could be used on the same highway?

Mr. CASE. That is partially true. The interstate system is a part of the primary system. It is the selected portions of the primary system which link the important centers. Federal-aid primary funds could be used on any part of the interstate system. I think that may be said as a generalization. But it would not necessarily be true that interstate funds could be used on all parts of the primary system.

Mr. BARRETT. The Senator from South Dakota is correct, but what I wish to ask is this: Could not 50 miles of roads be built with primary funds, and

the next 50 miles be constructed with interstate funds?

Mr. CASE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRISWOLD in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there are times when a simple announcement by a modest man has all the force and impact of a chapter of history. That kind of an announcement was made last Friday when our friend and colleague, EDWIN C. JOHNSON, the senior Senator from Colorado, announced that he would retire at the end of his present term.

Mr. President, it is difficult to think of the Senate without Ed JOHNSON. He is a quiet man, a man of few words, and even fewer speeches; but as a steadying force, Ed JOHNSON has few equals, and it will be many years before we see his like again.

I have always thought of Ed JOHNSON as "Mr. Wisdom." To me he has been the very image of sanity, of calm reason, of unconquerable common sense.

I have served with him on the Senate Democratic policy committee; I have served with him on the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; I have served with him on the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. In every instance I have found a sympathetic ear for my problems; a ready and always courteous response to my inquiries; and, above all, Mr. President, advice which never failed to be wise and always informed.

I can well understand Ed JOHNSON's desire for retirement. In his untiring zeal for the public welfare, he has spent most of his life carrying burdens which would have crushed lesser men. He has richly earned the right to lay those burdens aside and return to his native Colorado.

But he is a big man—big in every sense of the word. And big men do not leave our midst without creating an enormous void which is not easy to fill.

He will be sorely missed by the Democratic Party. But I venture to say that our regret over his decision will be felt on both sides of the aisle.

Ed JOHNSON is too big a man to be confined within partisan labels. He has served the people of his State and his Nation impartially, without regard to their party affiliations. They have responded to him in the same spirit.

Throughout the years, he built a record, step by step. It was a record of service to our people—a record based

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued April 7, 1954
For actions of April 6, 1954
83rd-2nd, No. 63

CONTENTS

Alaska.....2	Forestry.....4,15	Research.....21,24
Animal diseases.....10,12	Hawaii.....16	Road authorizations.....4
Appropriations.....1,21	Honey.....9	Statehood.....2,16
Dairy industry....11,18,23	Livestock.....10,12,20	Sugar Agreement.....6
Education.....24	Loans, farm.....14	Surplus commodities.....17
Electrification.....5	Personnel.....7	Trade, foreign....1,8,7,19
Farm program.....22	Price supports.....9,23	Water utilization.....3
Foreign aid.....13	Reclamation.....3	

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed Interior appropriation bill. Senate debated road-authorizations bill. Senate committee reported International Sugar Agreement. Senate committee reported Carlson personnel bill. Both Houses received Interior's report on the Colorado reclamation project.

HOUSE

1. INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955. Passed with amendments this bill, H. R. 8680 (pp. 4439-70).
2. STATEHOOD. Rep. Price objected to Gov. Heintzleman's suggestion for granting statehood to part of Alaska (p. 4471).
3. RECLAMATION. Both Houses received from the Interior Department a report on the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, providing for the development and utilization of the water and related resources of the Upper Colorado River Basin pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws (H. Doc. 364); to House and Senate Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs (pp. 4375, 4475).

SENATE

4. ROAD AUTHORIZATIONS. Continued debate on S. 3184, to authorize 1956-7 appropriations for roads, including forest highways and forest roads and trails (pp. 4388-400, 4410-13).
5. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Magnuson objected to suggestions that Bonneville power rates should be increased (pp. 4414-5).
6. SUGAR AGREEMENT. The Foreign Relations Committee reported without reservation the International Sugar Agreement, Executive B (Ex. Rept. 4) (p. 4374).
7. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported with amendments

S. 2665, the Carlson bill which liberalizes the Classification Act of 1949 and the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 (S. Rept. 1190), and Sen. Carlson discussed it (p. 4378).

8. FOREIGN TRADE. Received a Pa. Legislature resolution favoring protective tariffs (pp. 4376-7).
9. PRICE SUPPORTS. Sen. Wiley inserted a Wis. Beekeepers Assn. letter favoring price supports for honey (p. 4377).
10. ANIMAL DISEASES. Sen. Wiley inserted and discussed resolutions of the Wis. Legislative Council favoring adequate Federal funds to finance an animal-disease eradication program "as a realistic device to reduce surpluses" (pp. 4377-8).
11. MILK MARKETING. Sen. Wiley inserted and discussed resolutions of the Wis. Legislative Council favoring elimination of artificial domestic trade barriers to milk marketing (p. 4378).
12. ANIMAL DISEASES. Received a Calif. Legislature resolution favoring S. 114, providing for a Mexican boundary fence to prevent the spread of foot-and-mouth disease (p. 4375).
13. FOREIGN AID. The Foreign Relations Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. Res. 214, authorizing the committee to make a complete study of technical assistance and related programs (p. D374).
14. FARM LOANS. Received from this Department a proposed bill to eliminate the requirement that economic disaster loans be restricted to areas designated by the President and to make additional funds available for economic emergency loans; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 4375).
15. FORESTRY. Received a Calif. Legislature resolution favoring adequate fire-flood protection funds for national forests (p. 4375).
16. STATEHOOD. Received a Calif. Legislature resolution favoring Hawaii statehood (p. 4376).

BILLS INTRODUCED

17. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. S. 3262, by Sen. Wiley, to encourage the disposal of agricultural surpluses and to improve the U. S. foreign relations; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 4379).
18. DAIRY INDUSTRY. H. R. 8728, by Rep. Teague, to provide that the time and date of distribution shall be printed on milk-cream containers in D. C.; to D. C. Committee (p. 4476).

COMMITTEE HEARINGS RELEASED BY GPO

19. FOREIGN TRADE. Rye and barley imports. S. Judiciary Committee.

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

20. LIVESTOCK. Extension of remarks of Rep. Hoeven discussing the increased production of livestock in Iowa (p. A2613).

Government work. However, when the United States Government activated controls on materials, the jeweled watch industry very quickly jumped over to Government work.

"It was pointed out that the Gibb plant possesses automatic screw machines, pivot polishing machines, Safags, Mikrons, and Pederman screw machines. Gibb also has tool making facilities but, like other companies, turns to outside sources to supplement its own tool and die work. It was stated that there are plenty of tool and die shops in the southern Wisconsin area, and that the company does not depend in any way on the domestic watch industry for any help in the manufacture of mechanical time fuses. Hairsprings were furnished to them by the Borg Corp., and other springs were furnished by Perryman of Clifton, N. J., both outside of the watch industry.

"Gibb officials stated that, starting from scratch, including making of all dies, fixtures, tools and gages, they could be producing new fuses within 6 months. In connection with the 501 and 500 series fuses, the gages and fixtures are now owned by the United States Government and, therefore, they could get into production within approximately 4 months.

"They stated that the Gibb Corp., could make chronometers, and estimated it would take approximately 6 months.

"An official of the Gibb Corp., also stated that it was his belief that a good number of the fuses could be made by such nonwatch companies as Hoover Vacuum Cleaner, Monroe Calculator, Burroughs Adding Machine, Minneapolis-Honeywell, Sangamo Co., and Badger Meter Co. Most of these companies, he pointed out, are involved in making precision instruments for the Air Corps."

The following information was obtained from past and present officials of the Thomas A. Edison Co.:

"The Thomas A. Edison Co., has had a great deal of experience in the production of M-43 fuses. During World II, on the instructions of naval ordnance, they purchased from watch companies certain components such as escape arbors, pinion blanks, centrifugal gears and other parts, all of which were supplied to them by the Benrus Watch Co., an importer of watch movements from Switzerland. However, the Edison Co. representative stated flatly that if these instructions had not been given by naval ordnance, his company would have made the same parts themselves because they were capable of doing so. They possessed all the machinery and facilities for making these parts.

"It was pointed out that Edison started from scratch and ended up with the best firing record of any manufacturer of mechanical time fuses in the United States. At no time was Edison dependent on the domestic watch manufacturing companies for their skills or assistance.

"Mr. Wehrenberg of Westfield, N. J., was interviewed because he was at one time research director of the Special Products Division of the Thomas A. Edison Co. (1940-45) and was manager of the same division from 1945-47. During this time he was in charge of production of the M-43 mechanical time fuse for Edison.

"His opinion was similar to that given by all others interviewed that watch manufacturing experience is not essential to fuse manufacturing. He pointed out that the Edison Co. had made substantially all the parts necessary and possessed all the equipment such as hobbing machines, automatic screw machines, pivot polishing machines, etc. He stated that in the few instances in which they purchased parts or components from jeweled watch or pin lever watch companies, these purchases were made as a matter of convenience. The Edison Co. possessed, however, the capacity to make everything they purchased in this area.

"Perhaps the most important statements brought to light in our interview with Mr. Wehrenberg are the following:

"Watch engineering and manufacturing experience are not essential to the design and manufacture of mechanical time fuses. Fuses are designed especially to satisfy specific ordnance fuse objectives, and while they may have a clock mechanism, this clock mechanism has to be so engineered as to satisfy these objectives. For instance, the weight and composition of the parts and the centrifugal and other physical forces which are created when the fuse is either dropped from an airplane or used in an artillery shell necessitate a design of parts, such as pinions and gears, having characteristics different from those in a watch. In other words, the arrangement of a train of pinions and gears is a function of different factors. Accordingly, in the opinion of Mr. Wehrenberg, it might even be better for nonwatch experience to be utilized than to utilize watch experience.

"He felt, therefore, that the engineering skills developed by Edison, the Underwood Corp., Eclipse Division of Bendix and others were far better suited to this work than those of the domestic watch companies."

The following information was obtained from officials of the George W. Borg Corp.:

"The George W. Borg Corp. is perhaps one

of the most highly qualified corporations in the United States for the production of horological devices. It is so qualified, in fact, that within the last few years the Borg Corp. had actually considered entering the field as manufacturers of jeweled lever watches, but were deterred only by the fact that the problems of merchandising and marketing were so far afield from their normal experience that they decided for the time being not to enter the new field. In fact, however, they presently have the mechanical and production skills requisite for manufacturing jeweled lever watches.

"George W. Borg Corp. produces and ships hair springs of such fine quality that they are purchased by manufacturers in Switzerland.

"Especially significant is the experience of Borg Corp. during World War II in the production of mechanical time fuses. Borg found it necessary during that period, because of a lack of assistance that the domestic watch companies could give them, to make their own equipment, and develop facilities to make mechanical time fuses. They made their own Swiss automatic screw machines and other machines for that purpose. They found, too, as a result of their experience, that many parts normally made on Swiss automatic machines could now be produced on their own Brown & Sharpe machines. They developed many methods of increasing production.

"Their executives state that because of the reluctance and unwillingness of the American watch companies to supply them with parts and assistance during the Korean war that the Borg Corp. made the decision to produce all of their own parts.

"They advised that they have a tool and die shop capable of making any of the tools or dies necessary for mechanical time fuse production. They also advised that in the southern Wisconsin area there is a substantial number of subcontractors that they can call upon for making either parts or tools and dies if necessary to meet peak load requirements.

"In conducting this investigation we had a production executive and a chief engineer visit the Frankford Arsenal. Officials of Frankford Arsenal made the unsolicited statement that they did not consider the domestic jeweled-watch industry essential to the manufacture of mechanical time fuses and that this statement was recently made to representatives of the Defense Department. Interestingly enough, in inquiring into the fuse components and their manufacture in the United States, they informed us that the following additional companies made contributions through subcontracting:

"Part name	Company	Address	Products
Escapement arbor.....	Automatic Specialty Co..... Everlast Metal Products..... King-Seeley.....	Baltimore, Md..... New York, N. Y..... Ann Arbor, Mich.....	Automatic screw machine products. Aluminum ware. Oil gages, ammeters, speedometers, etc.
Centrifugal gear (blanked).....	Farrington Manufacturing Co.....	Boston, Mass.....	Covered metal jewel and display boxes, plastic display boxes, metal specialties, charge-plato credit service.
Escape gear (wheel).....	Thomaston Special Tool Co..... Heath Co..... King-Seeley..... Eastman-Kodak Co.....	Thomaston, Conn..... Benton Harbor, Mich..... Ann Arbor, Mich..... Rochester, N. Y.....	Special tools. Radio test equipment kits. See above. Photo film, paper, apparatus, supplies, and chemicals.
Gears Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4.....	M. H. Rhodes Co..... (Also Ingraham Watch and New Haven Clock.)	Hartford, Conn.....	Timing devices for delay action, electrical and mechanical; radio relays; automatic interval electrical switches; parking meters.
Gear No. 5.....	Obex Manufacturing Co., Inc.....	Lynbrook, Long Island, N. Y.....	Cameras, projectors, instrument and precision parts.
Adj. guide.....	Gruen Watch Co.....	Cincinnati, Ohio.....	Watches.
Escapement levers..... (All prime contractors—This is a delicate piece and is made in such a way as to be closely controlled to individual manufacturers' requirements.)	Eastern Watch Case Co.....	Waterbury, Conn.....	Watchcases.
Pinions Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4.....	Mally Manufacturing Co..... Howard Clock Products..... Bristol Instrument Gears..... Woodside Screw Machine Co., Inc..... Lormar Instrument Co.....	Waterbury, Conn..... Waltham, Mass..... Bristol, Conn..... Woodside, N. Y..... Neptune, N. J.....	Swiss screw machine products. Parts manufacturer. Gears and pinions, gear assemblies, etc. Screw machine parts; Swiss automatic.
Pinion No. 5..... (This is now made of hollow tubing, but the outside contours remain the same as the old pinion No. 5).			

"Part name	Company	Address	Products
Escape pins.....	Torrington Co.....	Torrington, Conn.....	See below. ¹
Firing pin shaft.....	General Phonograph Manufacturing Co., Inc.....	Putnam, Conn.....	Pointed steel goods.
Setback pin.....	Everlast Metal Products.....	New York, N. Y.....	See above.
	Specialty Screw Machine Products Co.....	Lancaster, Pa.....	Screw machine products, Swiss work, instrument parts, special screws.
	Revere Camera Co.....	Chicago, Ill.....	Cameras.
Plates Nos. 1 and 7.....	Forstner Chain Corp.....	Irvington, N. J.....	Jewelry.
(Tools for these parts are made by the Moore Tool & Die Co. of Bridgeport, Conn.)	Eastman-Kodak Co.....	Rochester, N. Y.....	See above.
	Farrington Manufacturing Co.....	Boston, Mass.....	Do.
Escape springs.....	George Perryman (owner of Windsor Manufacturing Co.).....	Clifton, N. J.....	Ping pong balls.
	Borg, George W., Products.....	Delavan, Wisc.....	Electronic and mechanical equipment.
Adjusting screws.....	Research Development Manufacturing Co.....	Philadelphia, Pa.....	Screw machine products, Swiss work, instrument parts, special screws.
	Woodside Screw Machine Products Co.....	Woodside, N. Y.....	See above.
	Acme Screw Products.....	Dayton, Ohio.....	Screw machine products."

¹ Torrington Co. Products: Needles, needle bearings, bicycle spokes, nipples, pedals, handle bars, swaging machinery, small metal specialties, precision machined and ground; pins; blades; pivots; studs.

Information obtained from officials of the International Business Machines plant in Toronto, Canada, regarding their mechanical time fuse manufacturing:

"The company's normal business is, of course, calculating machines. It presently has contracts for the manufacture of the M-501 fuse and the M-502 fuse for the Canadian Government. All drawings and specifications are being supplied by the Frankford Arsenal at Philadelphia, Pa. For all practical purposes, this contract is being given technical and engineering supervision by Frankford Arsenal, although paid for by the Canadian Government.

"IBM of Canada received its contract for this fuse in the summer of 1952. Approximately 9 months after they received their contract, they began to make delivery. At the start, some parts were supplied by other companies such as Eastman Kodak, George W. Borg, King-Seeley, etc., but in no case was IBM supplied with parts by a United States jeweled watch company. After a year's experience, IBM was producing all the parts as well as the complete fuse in their plant, except for the escapement spring which it buys from George W. Borg. The purchase of this spring from Borg is a matter of convenience rather than necessity. During this period of time, IBM had to acquire most of the necessary equipment, such as pinion cutters and gear hobbors, etc., as well as to create the tools and dies, make the parts, and assemble the fuse. It makes all its own tools and dies for the parts for this fuse, including the gear dies.

"IBM is now producing fuses at the rate of a thousand a day. This plant employs 1,500 people. IBM officials indicated that they could make their own machines and equipment, if necessary, in order to make the parts to build the fuse. However, this was not necessary since they were able to acquire all the machines required for the job in sufficient time to meet their delivery commitments. They have in their immediate vicinity a large number of tool and die companies who could supply them with the type of tools and dies that are necessary, and there are also small manufacturing plants in the area to whom they could farm out, if necessary, many of the small parts that are required for the job. They advise that they did not need the help of the American jeweled watch industry in order to make the fuse, nor did they have occasion to call upon them. In the interest of getting the job done at the earliest possible time, they called upon others for engineering advice and help, and it is interesting to note that the people they called on were Eastman Kodak, George W. Borg, King-Seeley, as well as Frankford Arsenal, who, as is generally known, have the manufacturing facilities and the engineering know-how for this family of fuses.

"It is also interesting to note that, whereas Canada may have called on us during the last war for mechanical time fuses, there is now a Canadian plant set up and self-sufficient for the manufacture of mechanical time fuses."

CONSTRUCTION OF HIGHWAYS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3184) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended, and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in urging the passage of Senate bill 3184, I know I am voicing the sentiments of the people of my State.

The people of Texas believe in good roads. They know the value of good roads. They long have considered good roads a sign of progress. This feeling on the part of Texans is reflected in our State's marvelous highway system.

The job of building and maintaining adequate highways is, of course, an especially big one in Texas. After all, the State of Texas makes up about one-twelfth of the total area of this country. The maintained mileage of the Texas Highway System has increased from 23,400 miles in 1940 to the 45,169 miles maintained at the beginning of this year. After we complete the additional mileage already designated and financed, the maintained mileage of the Texas Highway System will be 50,581 miles. That is well over twice the mileage of the system in 1940.

Most of this expansion has come about since the end of World War II. That is particularly true of the Texas farm-to-market road system. We now have in Texas a total of 24,295 miles of farm-to-market roads, built or designated and financed. This system has been developed principally since 1945. During the years 1950 and 1951 alone, the Texas Highway Department placed between 3,000 and 4,000 miles of farm-to-market roads under construction each year.

During the period from 1940 to 1953, travel on Texas highways more than doubled. Texas motor-vehicle registrations rose from 1,920,000 in 1941 to 3,550,000 last year. In other words, we now have almost 1 motor vehicle for

every 2 Texas citizens. All the highways, roads, and streets in Texas serve 86 million vehicle-miles of travel daily.

Mr. President, I have recited these facts to show that the State of Texas has not neglected its highway system.

The passage of Senate bill 3184 would enable Texas, as it would enable all other States, to continue the program of highway progress.

Mr. President, the proposed increase in Federal aid for highways simply recognizes the fact that our national highway system is falling behind domestic civil needs. In addition, of course, an adequate highway system is vitally essential to our national defense.

It is especially noteworthy, I think, that Senate bill 3184 would provide six times as much money for the interstate highway system as is provided under the present law—\$150 million annually, as compared with the \$25 million annually now provided.

The increase in Federal aid would not be confined to the interstate system. Primary roads, secondary roads, urban highways—all would receive more Federal aid than at present.

As compared with the present law, Senate bill 3184 provides \$910 million a year for the Federal-aid highway systems, as against \$575 million as of today. The increase is, in my opinion, fully justified.

Highway engineers say that the United States now has a \$35 billion deficiency in highway improvements. In my own State, the grand total of our highways' needs is estimated by Dewitt Greer, our outstandingly able State highway engineer, at \$1,665,310,000.

Mr. President, the Federal aid of \$910 million a year provided by Senate bill 3184—together with the sums spent by State governments and local governments—would be a long step forward in meeting the national deficiency.

We in Texas know that money spent to build and maintain good roads where they are needed is never wasted.

Because I know the situation in my own State, I would like, Mr. President, to give a brief résumé of the backlog of badly needed highway work that has been planned by the Texas Highway Department.

It is estimated that \$100 million will be expended for construction and recon-

struction of the Texas highway system during the present calendar year. That will exhaust all the funds that will be available to the department for the year.

In addition to projects previously programmed by the Texas Highway Commission covering this sum of \$100 million, a sizable list of advance planning has been authorized—particularly on the primary and interstate highway systems, both rural and urban in nature. This advance planning work, on which the Texas Highway Department has become obligated, amounts to \$287,100,000 in construction work.

We have needed work on the primary and interstate highway systems in Texas amounting to \$121 million, on which all the right-of-way has been secured and on which construction plans are well advanced.

We have needed construction work on the same highway systems in the amount of \$23,800,000, on which some planning work has been done and some right-of-way secured.

We have construction work which has been committed in the amount of \$142,300,000, on which right-of-way deeds have not yet been submitted to the county or city but on which planning work is in progress. That is the status of the Texas highway system.

Passage of S. 3184 would enable Texas, by matching Federal funds with State funds, to continue to make sound progress in building and maintaining its highway system.

Other States would be similarly affected.

Mr. President, I consider this proposed legislation to be in the public interest.

I call attention to the fact that the proposed increase in Federal aid has the backing of the President, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Bureau of Public Roads.

It has, also, the backing of the people generally—and they are the beneficiaries of good roads.

The farmer needing a good road between his farm and his market place; the merchant who draws his customers from the surrounding countryside and who receives much of his merchandise over highways from adjacent cities; the salesman whose livelihood depends upon his ability to travel swiftly and safely; the tremendous trucking industry; the millions of families who exercise the traditional American privilege of taking a 2-week traveling vacation—these, Mr. President, are the people who benefit from good roads.

We will act in their best interests by passing this bill to increase the amount of Federal highway aid made available to the several States.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, during the debate yesterday afternoon, I placed before the Senate a picture showing how the bill S. 3184 will affect the Federal highway program for 1954. I pointed out that whereas at the present time the existing law authorizes a total of \$652,500,000, S. 3184 proposes a total of \$1,002,000,000, an amount substantially the equivalent of the receipts from the several taxes on motor fuels. It is sub-

stantially the equivalent of what the anticipated Federal taxes on gasoline, diesel fuel, and lubricating oils will provide for the fiscal years 1956 and 1957.

In fiscal 1953, these excise taxes on motor fuels yielded \$979 million, within \$21 million of \$1 billion. The receipts from these taxes have been increasing at the rate of 5 percent a year. So it is believed that for the fiscal years 1956 and 1957, for which the bill provides, the receipts will pass the \$1 billion mark.

Mr. President, this is the 17th time a Federal-aid highway bill has been brought before Congress for consideration. These bills have provided for Federal cooperation with the States in highway building over a continuous span of 38 years, interrupted only during the war years.

The Federal-aid program has been an outstanding success. It has stimulated cooperation among the States in agreeing upon roads crossing State borders. It has aided in developing more nearly uniform road standards throughout the Nation. It has given impetus to research which leads the way toward better and safer highways. The matching features have encouraged greater progress on the State programs.

It should be remembered that Federal highway bills are not Federal construction programs. Instead, they provide a measure of Federal aid for the State and local highway programs. The States match the Federal funds, dollar for dollar, and they perform all construction work on Federal-aid roads.

Actually, the States spend much greater sums on highway work than Congress provides in Federal aid. The States not only put up their matching money, but quite a bit more. In 1953, for example, State and local governments spent \$2.7 billion for road construction, and an additional \$2.2 billion for maintenance and financing costs. In that year the Federal Government contributed about half a billion dollars in Federal funds—to be more precise, \$515 million—whereas the States were putting up, in their programs, a total of almost \$5 billion.

I have before me a table which has been prepared by Mr. S. Howard Brown, president of the contractors' division of the American Road Builders Association, which very graphically portrays the amount of highway construction, in terms of dollars, performed by the several States in the calendar year 1953. This information is based upon the actual construction under contracts awarded by the several State highway departments. Each State is listed with respect to what the total contract lettings of the State were. There then follows a column which shows the amount of State construction. Next is a column showing the amount of Federal-aid funds in connection with each of the contracts. The fourth column shows the percentage of State highway department construction under the Federal-aid program. It is a very remarkable showing.

Let me cite the example of an outstanding State. I shall refer to the State of the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut, who I observe occupying the chair of the majority leader at the moment.

The State Highway Department of Connecticut, in 1953, let contracts totaling \$11,161,000. The amount of Federal-aid funds was \$3,279,000. The State's portion was \$6,645,000.

This is a graphic illustration of the way in which the aid advanced by the Federal Government has stimulated expenditures by a State, and the State has provided almost twice the amount provided by the Federal Government.

In the State of Pennsylvania, contracts were let in 1953 totaling \$105,366,000. The Federal-aid share of that amount was only \$19,791,000. The balance of that amount was provided by either the State, counties, or cities.

I am certain the entire table will be of interest to all Members of the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Influence of Federal aid on highway construction—Highway construction contracts awarded by State highway departments, calendar year 1953¹

State	Total State highway department construction ²	Portion of total State construction under Federal-aid program	Federal-aid funds	Percent of State highway department construction under Federal-aid program
	Thousands	Thousands	Thousands	
Alabama.....	\$26,892	\$18,557	\$9,875	69.0
Arizona.....	14,809	10,579	6,859	71.4
Arkansas.....	13,065	7,962	3,837	60.9
California.....	95,319	62,167	34,760	65.2
Colorado.....	16,403	14,117	9,782	86.0
Connecticut.....	11,161	6,645	3,279	60.4
Delaware.....	10,454	6,412	3,256	61.3
Florida.....	29,938	15,642	8,059	62.2
Georgia.....	29,543	23,107	11,835	78.2
Idaho.....	12,341	11,990	8,720	97.1
Illinois.....	90,626	53,124	27,264	58.6
Indiana.....	31,508	24,823	13,782	78.8
Iowa.....	36,643	19,540	9,860	53.3
Kansas.....	27,188	21,478	10,739	79.2
Kentucky.....	33,046	16,305	8,228	49.3
Louisiana.....	33,129	17,767	9,147	53.6
Maine.....	18,056	9,486	4,718	52.5

Footnotes at end of table.

Influence of Federal aid on highway construction—Highway construction contracts awarded by State highway departments, calendar year 1953—Continued

State	Total State highway department construction ²	Portion of total State construction under Federal-aid program	Federal-aid funds	Percent of State highway department construction under Federal-aid program
	Thousands	Thousands	Thousands	
Maryland.....	\$26,539	\$9,465	\$7,944	36.9
Massachusetts.....	61,801	17,579	8,783	28.4
Michigan.....	56,674	33,217	16,372	58.6
Minnesota.....	40,587	20,833	10,799	51.3
Mississippi.....	17,779	15,385	8,470	86.5
Missouri.....	32,960	21,131	10,567	64.1
Montana.....	10,382	10,382	6,357	100.0
Nebraska.....	8,532	7,839	4,001	91.9
Nevada.....	5,458	5,087	4,409	93.7
New Hampshire.....	6,703	4,249	2,342	63.4
New Jersey.....	36,420	20,422	10,062	56.0
New Mexico.....	15,596	12,612	8,344	80.8
New York.....	214,489	71,151	35,746	33.2
North Carolina.....	37,616	18,859	9,131	50.1
North Dakota.....	12,913	11,740	5,855	90.9
Ohio.....	44,106	33,776	16,108	76.5
Oklahoma.....	39,987	18,348	9,401	45.9
Oregon.....	34,042	32,264	21,843	94.7
Pennsylvania.....	105,366	39,613	19,791	37.6
Rhode Island.....	6,403	6,159	3,079	96.2
South Carolina.....	19,978	11,023	6,468	55.2
South Dakota.....	16,710	13,760	10,111	82.3
Tennessee.....	45,678	20,429	10,498	44.7
Texas.....	105,886	59,246	32,401	55.1
Utah.....	9,449	7,526	5,737	79.6
Vermont.....	4,237	4,002	2,079	94.5
Virginia.....	31,436	20,694	10,408	65.8
Washington.....	33,716	16,768	10,012	49.7
West Virginia.....	27,012	12,844	6,421	47.5
Wisconsin.....	45,963	29,260	15,060	64.6
Wyoming.....	9,917	7,244	5,236	73.0
District of Columbia.....	2,788	1,848	963	66.3

¹ Estimated.

² Includes contracts awarded for special toll facilities and work by force account.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, good as the highway program has been in the past, we are confronted by the sad fact that there is a tremendous deficiency in our highways. Wars have interrupted the prosecution of our highway program, and today traffic has far outstripped highway capacity.

The war years took a severe toll in deterioration and obsolescence, from which we have not recovered. Now we find that about 64 percent of the Federal-aid system roads need improvement. That improvement will cost altogether about \$35 billion. The best efforts at all levels of government, over a considerable period of time, will be needed to bring our highways up to standard so that they can handle today's traffic of 55 million vehicles.

Members of the committee feel that the Federal Government should now move to meet the great highway deficiency. The increased sums we have proposed in Federal aid will of themselves help to a certain extent. Moreover, we expect that these increases will further spur the States to greater efforts so that the actual effect will go considerably beyond the amounts of the increases.

We feel that if we authorize Federal aid in approximately the total amount of the Federal taxes collected on gasoline, diesel fuel, and lubricating oils we will be giving States an example of good faith and responsibility that will encourage them a great deal.

In that connection, I should like to repeat, for the attention of the Members now on the floor, the increases provided under the several categories. The Federal primary system today gets \$247,-

500,000. We are proposing to increase that to \$342 million, representing an increase of almost \$100 million for the Federal primary system.

Under our proposal, an increase is provided for the secondary system from \$165 million to \$228 million.

The urban system presently gets \$137,500,000. We are proposing to increase that to \$190 million.

In all 3 of these systems, the Federal primary, Federal secondary, and Federal urban, we are proposing to increase the amounts from the present total of \$550 million to \$760 million.

In addition to that, the committee is reporting a sixfold increase for the interstate system, which is now at the level of \$25 million. We propose to increase that to \$150 million.

There are several significant differences between S. 3184 and the bill recently passed by the House of Representatives.

In the first place, the Senate bill provides a billion dollars instead of a total of \$875 million, as I have previously pointed out.

In the second place, the Senate bill contains no provision, such as the House bill contains, making the entire interstate highway authorization contingent on continuance of the 2-cent Federal excise tax on gasoline. The committee felt this would be a bad legislative precedent, making the authorization contingent on certain revenues, whether they come from sales of gasoline or perfume or household appliances. We felt it would be a bad precedent for our highway system, linking the program with a certain class of revenues, without regard for needs. Highway officials are

practically unanimous in their fierce opposition to the principle of "linkage." And we felt it would be reckless, risking the entire interstate system—which needs improvements most desperately, according to the great bulk of testimony given us, and which needs Federal encouragement most particularly—on a single tax item.

In the third place, the Senate bill contains no provision, such as the House bill contains, allowing transfer of up to 25 percent of the amount apportioned to any State from one system—primary, secondary, or urban—to another system. There was no evidence to show that the present percentages of apportionment have brought about excessive development of one system at the expense of the others. Permission to transfer funds might deprive any single system of as much as 50 percent of its funds.

In that connection I invite the attention of the Members of the Senate to page 9 of the committee report.

The 25-percent provision, it will be noted, could be applied two ways. Twenty-five percent could be taken from the urban system and 25 percent from the primary system, and that could be put on the secondary system. If that were done, the secondary system would be increased 50 percent by taking 25 percent from each of the other systems. Or 25 percent could be taken from the primary system and 25 percent from the secondary system, and that 50 percent could be applied to the urban system. I believe the House bill contains a provision that the total amount transferred shall not exceed 25 percent. However, that could be done in any one of three ways, depending on the attitude of the highway commission, the governor, or the legislature of the State involved, whoever would make the determination as to the transfer. So the committee felt that such a provision disturbing the existing relationship between the systems should not be adopted without conclusive evidence to show its necessity.

I should now like to invite the attention of the Senate for a few moments to the proposal with respect to the interstate system and its apportionment. This is doubtless a matter the Senate will want to consider carefully. The interests of all the States are affected by the formulas for apportionment and by the ratios of matching.

The first thing which should be understood is that the bill proposes no change whatsoever in (a) the proportionate relationship between the amounts authorized for the primary, secondary, and urban systems, our regular traditional highway network, or (b) the method of apportionment to the States for these systems, or (c) the Federal-aid matching ratio for these systems.

The primary, secondary, and urban systems will each receive the same percentage as in the past of the total authorization for the three, that is, 45 percent for the primary, 30 percent for the secondary, and 25 percent for the urban. The total authorization will be apportioned to the States exactly as before, and matched on a 50-50 basis as before.

The total authorizations will be apportioned exactly as before, under what we call section 21. That is, one-third on the basis of population, one-third on the basis of road mileage, and one-third on the basis of area. The primary and secondary systems will be apportioned on that basis.

The only change affecting the primary, secondary, and urban systems is the proposal to authorize substantially larger amounts for each than previous Federal-aid highway acts—a total of \$760 million compared to \$550 million in the 1952 act.

The changes in the formula for apportionment and in matching ratio apply only to the sharply increased authorization for the interstate system, in the amount of \$150 million.

There is no thought whatsoever, and I wish to stress this as much as the RECORD can show it is stressed, that this difference in the interstate system should be a precedent for extending a new formula for apportionment or a new matching ratio to the regular systems—primary, secondary, and urban. Quite the contrary. Most likely the present formulas and the present ratio will remain intact for many, many years.

It is also true that every State will receive a greater total for all the systems combined than has been appropriated heretofore. A total for each of the States will be found at pages 5 and 6 of the report accompanying the bill.

In dealing with the interstate system, however, the committee believes we face an emergency, because of which there were several new proposals, all backed with strong and logical arguments.

One proposal was that the amount of authorization for the interstate system be greatly increased from \$25 million, as authorized in 1952. The argument based on need could not be denied. The committee considered recommending an authorization of \$100 million, and also considered recommending an authorization of \$200 million, as proposed in the bill as passed by the House of Representatives. Finally we settled upon an authorization of \$150 million, and that is what now is proposed.

The second proposal was that the interstate system funds be apportioned to the States on the basis of population alone. This was strongly urged by the American Association of State Highway Officials, the American Automobile Association, and many other groups interested in highway legislation from a national point of view. We compromised on this issue, and accepted the House provision, proposing that half of the interstate authorization—or \$75 million—be apportioned on the basis of population, and that the other half be apportioned according to the traditional formula incorporating area, mileage, and population.

Of the total Federal-aid authorization of \$910 million, the new method of apportionment affects, therefore, only \$75 million.

Another proposal was that the Federal-aid ratio for matching on the interstate system be changed from the traditional 50-50 basis, in recognition of the greater Federal interest in this

“backbone” system of highway and the greater cost, due to the higher standards of construction required.

At one time a 75-25 percent ratio was used when the strategic network was begun; and there was some suggestion to use it again, so as to make it easier, or, one might say, more attractive for the States to match the Federal funds and to use their available funds in building the interstate system. But this would also mean a smaller total amount spent on Federal-aid interstate road construction than if the States had to match on a 50-50 basis. That is to say, assuming an authorized appropriation of \$150 million for interstate highways, on the 50-50 basis the States would have to put up another \$150 million, making a total of \$300 million. On the other hand, on the 75-25 percent basis, the States would have to put up only \$50 million, making a total of \$200 million available.

Thus, as the Senator from Kansas will see, we would have \$100 million less for construction of the interstate highways.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. CASE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I am very much interested in the highway program. I think I understand the distribution of funds among the States in the case of primary, secondary, and urban highways, but I am not so familiar with the distribution of funds in connection with the interstate system.

As I understood the Senator from South Dakota, he said we had been providing \$25 million for the interstate highway fund, and now it is proposed that the fund be increased to \$150 million, to be allocated under a new formula. Let me ask what the old formula was or how was the fund previously distributed?

Mr. CASE. The present fund of \$25 million is distributed on the three-way basis of area, population, and mileage. For example, to state the matter specifically, on pages 5, 6, and 7 of the report there are tables which give the apportionment of the \$25 million, under the 1952 act, for each of the States; and on pages 5 and 6 there is another table showing the apportionment of \$75 million on a population basis, and \$75 million according to section 21 of the Federal Highway Act, making a total of \$150 million.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield further to me?

Mr. CASE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish the Senator from South Dakota would clarify the question of distribution of the funds for the interstate highway system and the amount of funds on a percentage basis which the States will be required to match. It would help me very materially if the Senator from South Dakota would do that.

Mr. CASE. First, let us consider the total. If the amount is matched on a 50-50 basis—the normal basis of matching—obviously, \$150 million provided by the Federal Government would call for a total of \$150 million to be put up by the several States, so there would be provided a total of \$300 million for the interstate system.

If the matching occurs on a 75-25 percent basis, the Federal Government would put up \$3 for each dollar the States put up; in other words, the Federal Government would put up a total of \$150 million, and the States would put up a total of \$50 million, making a grand total of \$200 million.

However, the committee compromised on a 60-40 percent matching basis, which means that the Federal Government would put up \$6 for every \$4 put up by the States. The intent is thereby to have the Federal Government provide a substantial part of the cost of the interstate system.

In the case of the interstate system 3 or 4 elements of cost are greater than in the case of either the primary or the secondary systems. The first is that the rights of way required for the selected roads of the interstate system are, in many instances, higher in cost than are the normal rights-of-way.

The second is that a great part of the interstate system connects the capitals or the large cities of the country. Therefore, that system reflects a heavier flow of traffic, which, in turn, requires a heavier base course, heavier paving, wider highways, and other elements which enter into the situation—as, for instance, signaling and cloverleaf designs for access to the highways. All of them result in higher cost.

Recognizing, therefore, that the tendency of some State commissions might be to use their funds for matching in connection with either the normal primary or secondary systems, it was the opinion of the committee that by offering the funds on a 60-40 percentage basis, the States would be attracted or persuaded to use their available funds for matching for the interstate roads, and thereby help complete the interstate system.

I also invite the attention of the Senate to the chart appearing on the easel at the rear of the Chamber. It shows a map of the United States, on which is displayed the interstate system. By examining the map, Senators can determine the recognized interstate system for their States and all other States.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield further?

Mr. CASE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. As I have stated, I have had some experience, as Governor of a State, in dealing with primary, secondary, and urban highways. However, the interstate system is comparatively new.

I can very well appreciate the need of funds for this type of highway, because of the greatly increased cost of construction in certain areas which are densely

populated and highly developed, and for other reasons.

I wonder whether the proposals of the committee in respect to the interstate system and the basis of distribution of funds the Senator from South Dakota has mentioned had the approval of the State highway commissions and others interested in the construction of such highways.

Mr. CASE. The Association of Highway Officials wanted to go further than the committee went; that is, they wanted an appropriation of \$200 million by the Federal Government to be authorized, and they wanted all the funds to be distributed on the basis of population. However, the committee felt that it would be a little abrupt to make that much of a change in the apportioning plan; and, as I have stated, the committee voted for the adoption of the 60-40 plan.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Is it not true that the bill as passed by the House of Representatives provides for authorization of an appropriation of \$200 million, and that provision probably was based on the suggestion of the Association of Highway Officials?

Mr. CASE. I think that is correct; the House accepted that recommendation.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield further to me?

Mr. CASE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate the problems involved in connection with the expansion of our highway program, and I am somewhat familiar with them.

I believe that we in Kansas, because of some previous State highway legislation and because of funds we have available, will be able to match all the money authorized by this bill.

One thing about which I am concerned is the possibility that in the future we shall provide a new formula for the distribution of highway funds. Does the Senator from South Dakota feel that in connection with this bill we might be setting a pattern for the interstate system which eventually would extend to the primary, secondary, and urban highway systems?

Mr. CASE. No; I do not accept that as a likelihood.

The reason for that is that one must consider the purposes of the several systems.

The purpose of the secondary system is to provide farm-to-market roads, and it would be practically impossible to provide an aid program for farm-to-market roads on the basis of population and serve that particular system.

The primary road system serves the particular purpose of creating in every State roads which will connect the principal cities and county seats and will develop a degree of highway standardization which will cause the highways of one State to conform to or be similar to those of other States.

As the Senator from Kansas examines the map in the rear of the Chamber, he will see that in connection with the interstate system, there are some very large

open spaces. If we did not have a Federal-aid primary program we would not have any highways of very high standard in the large open spaces. As the Senator knows, the States of Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, and North Dakota, which are in the central part of the country, do not have a great network of interstate roads. They must have a primary road program if they are to have good roads between the county seats and the principal cities. So a distribution on the basis of population alone would not serve the primary system, and would not serve the secondary system. The Senator from South Dakota very definitely feels that there will never be any acceptance by the Senate Committee on Public Works of a proposal to apply a population basis for the distribution of either the primary or the secondary road money.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to take this opportunity to express my personal appreciation to the Committee on Public Works, which brings this important piece of highway legislation to the floor of the Senate. I think the amount of the proposed increase is well in keeping with the need for highway construction, in view of the rapidly increasing number of automobiles and trucks on our highways. From the standpoint of using the revenue which is obtained from the gasoline tax, or at least a greater proportion of it, the bill is in keeping with modern times. In 1950 I was chairman of the governors' conference. In that year and in previous years we called the attention of the Congress of the United States to the fact that we were collecting \$1 billion or more in gasoline taxes and using probably \$500 million for highway work, the balance going into the Federal Treasury for General Government expenses. I believe that the proposal to use a greater proportion of the revenue from the gasoline tax for highway purposes is a forward step.

I wish to commend the junior Senator from South Dakota and the committee. I think they have rendered the country a great service in bringing this piece of proposed legislation to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. CASE. The Senator's very generous remarks are deeply appreciated. In response, I should like to emphasize a little further the reason for the apportionment proposed with respect to interstate highways. In that connection, I invite the attention of Senators to the table which appears on page 66 of the hearings. The table shows the designated mileage of the interstate system for each of the States, the cost of the work needed to complete the interstate system, and the percentage of cost which is represented by the work to be accomplished in each State. It also shows the population, percentagewise, and the percentage of apportionment under section 21, together with the apportionment on a population basis.

The reason for including this table in the Record is that Members of the Senate may determine the ratio of proposed funds to the amount of work to be done.

There are 2 or 3 States to which attention should be invited, because they make the whole point.

In California, for example, the cost of the work to be accomplished would be \$1,169,427,000. That is 10.38 percent of the cost of the total interstate system. Ten percent of the cost of the interstate system would be expended in completing the system in California. Yet if we were to apportion the money on the basis of section 21—the old three-way division—California would receive but 4.74 percent of the money, less than half the amount necessary to complete the system.

The same thing is approximately true in Pennsylvania, where the cost of the interstate system to be completed represents 8.22 percent of the dollars required for the total system. Apportionment under section 21 would mean only 4.05 percent, representing less than half of the dollars required, proportionately, to complete the system.

Almost the same thing is true in Illinois. Perhaps the situation is a little worse in that State, because Illinois has 7.60 percent of the cost, but the apportionment under section 21 would provide only 3.98 percent.

It so happens that in my State apportionment under the old formula would give us slightly more in dollars than the compromise formula proposed by the committee; but it must be remembered that the interstate system is a national system, designed to meet a national need in a time of emergency. We are thinking in terms of building highways which will make it possible to transport huge quantities of material for national defense, and also, if need be, to provide ways for people to get out of cities or into cities, according to the developments of any particular situation. So I feel that the interstate system is amply justified in the amounts and on the basis proposed.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. What would be the total cost of the interstate system according to present estimates?

Mr. CASE. The estimates for the cost of the work needed to complete the system show a total of \$11,266,372,000.

Mr. MARTIN. How much is it proposed to appropriate in this bill?

Mr. CASE. One hundred and fifty million dollars.

Mr. MARTIN. Has the Senator made an estimate as to how many years would be required to complete the system at this rate of appropriation?

Mr. CASE. Assuming that the States put up \$4 for each \$6 the Federal Government puts up, \$250 million is one-fourth of a billion, and it would require 4 years to get \$1 billion. Eleven billion dollars would require 44 years.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. How much revenue does the Government receive from the Federal gas tax and the automobile and other excise taxes which are included in the formula for highway allotment?

Mr. CASE. For the year 1953 the Federal Government received \$979 million in excise taxes on gasoline, diesel fuel oil, and lubricating oil.

Mr. POTTER. How much does the bill contemplate giving back to the States in grants for highway construction?

Mr. CASE. The bill contemplates a total of \$1,002,000,000. That is practically the equivalent of what the excise taxes will produce for the years to which the bill is applicable. The bill is really an authorization for the fiscal years 1956 and 1957. Receipts have been increasing at a rate between 5 and 10 percent a year, so we feel that the \$979 million received in the fiscal year 1953 will reach \$1 billion in 1956 and 1957.

Mr. POTTER. So it is anticipated that nearly 100 percent of the Federal excise taxes on gasoline and lubricating oil will go back to the States for highway purposes.

Mr. CASE. That is the intent of the bill.

Possibly I should clarify that answer in one respect. The total of the Federal-aid programs is \$910 million. The bill authorizes \$90 million for roads on Federal lands, such as park roads, forest roads and trails, and Indian roads. The total of \$910 million plus \$90 million makes an even \$1 billion. Then there is authorized \$2½ million for roads on public lands. The total is the equivalent of the amount received from the special excise taxes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the table to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

National system of interstate highways

State	Mileage	Percent of mileage	Cost of work needed †	Percent of cost	Population, percent	Apportionment, sec. 21	Apportionment, population basis
Alabama	890.8	2.40	\$87,976	0.78	2.03	2.18	1.92
Arizona	1,136.9	3.06	92,108	.82	.50	1.54	1.75
Arkansas	517.8	1.39	78,289	.69	1.27	1.71	1.19
California	1,900.5	5.11	1,169,427	10.38	7.02	4.74	6.62
Colorado	661.7	1.78	72,294	.64	.88	1.86	.83
Connecticut	262.4	.71	219,302	1.95	1.33	.65	1.26
Delaware	25.5	.07	49,428	.44	.21	.50	.75
Florida	1,141.2	3.07	115,263	1.02	1.84	1.64	1.73
Georgia	1,110.6	2.99	175,728	1.56	2.29	2.56	2.15
Idaho	616.9	1.66	50,243	.45	.39	1.28	.75
Illinois	1,540.9	4.15	856,378	7.60	5.78	3.98	5.45
Indiana	1,065.4	2.87	389,437	3.46	2.61	2.45	2.46
Iowa	670.2	1.80	78,349	.70	1.74	2.51	1.64
Kansas	701.5	1.89	89,783	.80	1.26	2.52	1.19
Kentucky	648.4	1.74	181,933	1.61	1.95	1.90	1.84
Louisiana	597.1	1.61	221,010	1.96	1.78	1.59	1.68
Maine	300.4	.81	74,171	.66	.61	.87	.75
Maryland	265.5	.71	242,278	2.15	1.55	.90	1.47
Massachusetts	335.8	.90	451,896	4.01	3.11	1.30	2.93
Michigan	962.5	2.59	416,399	3.70	4.23	3.21	3.98
Minnesota	850.5	2.29	161,511	1.43	1.98	2.72	1.87
Mississippi	691.0	1.86	88,140	.78	1.45	1.84	1.36
Missouri	1,070.8	2.88	235,284	2.09	2.62	2.97	2.47
Montana	1,243.7	3.35	116,604	1.03	.39	2.09	.75
Nebraska	460.6	1.24	48,239	.43	.88	2.00	.83
Nevada	537.3	1.45	19,568	.17	.11	1.34	.75
New Hampshire	201.0	.55	40,329	.36	.35	.50	.75
New Jersey	192.4	.52	404,053	3.59	3.21	1.34	3.02
New Mexico	1,012.5	2.72	58,110	.52	.45	1.69	.75
New York	1,034.3	2.78	862,261	7.65	9.84	4.85	9.27
North Carolina	712.7	1.92	72,857	.65	2.70	2.54	2.54
North Dakota	498.3	1.34	45,151	.40	.41	1.51	.75
Ohio	1,216.4	3.27	758,591	6.73	5.27	3.59	4.97
Oklahoma	780.1	2.10	166,418	1.48	1.48	2.21	1.40
Oregon	703.0	1.89	117,915	1.05	1.01	1.77	.95
Pennsylvania	1,356.9	3.65	926,579	8.22	6.97	4.05	6.56
Rhode Island	48.6	.13	86,008	.76	.53	.50	.75
South Carolina	697.0	1.88	119,569	1.06	1.40	1.39	1.32
South Dakota	514.7	1.39	44,835	.40	.43	1.61	.75
Tennessee	1,044.9	2.81	241,658	2.15	2.18	2.20	2.06
Texas	2,764.8	7.44	435,988	3.87	5.12	6.68	4.82
Utah	704.1	1.89	84,253	.75	.46	1.19	.75
Vermont	339.8	.91	54,419	.48	.25	.50	.75
Virginia	901.7	2.43	207,309	1.84	2.20	1.96	2.08
Washington	579.5	1.56	184,460	1.64	1.68	1.71	1.49
West Virginia	211.9	.57	206,610	1.83	1.33	1.12	1.25
Wisconsin	449.1	1.21	127,204	1.13	2.28	2.45	2.15
Wyoming	972.7	2.62	60,070	.53	.19	1.29	.75
District of Columbia	16.6	.04	180,670	1.60	.53	.50	.75
Total	37,158.9	100.00	11,266,372	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

† Thousands, based on estimates by individual States, not adjusted to current price levels.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The bill contains \$1 billion and a few odd million for the total program, but for Federal aid the amount is only \$900 million.

Mr. CASE. The amount for Federal-aid programs is \$910 million. The remainder is for roads many of which are links in the interstate system or in the primary system.

At this point I think possibly I should modify the answer which I gave to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] a while ago when he was asking how long a time would be required to complete the interstate system. In our rough arithmetic we figured that it might require 44 years. There is one modification which should be suggested, and that is that the interstate system is the primary system, and it is possible for States to build a part of the interstate

system by using primary system money. In fact, in some States that is done. Money for interstate roads can be used on the portions of the primary system which are designated as parts of the interstate system. However, it does not work both ways; that is, it is not possible to use interstate road money on all parts of the primary system, but only on the parts that are designated as interstate.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. What I wanted to do was to impress upon the Members of the Senate how far we are behind in the construction of the interstate system. I made the statement yesterday, in my brief opening remarks relative to the bill, that the important means of transportation, from the earliest days of America down to the present, has been our road system. It is not our railroads or our waterways or our air ways that unite the States, but it is our interstate system of highways. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee and I were discussing that point only a moment ago.

General Washington, when he became President, saw the need of a road opening up the West from the vicinity of the National Capital. That road is now Route 50. The celebrated men of Kentucky and of Tennessee, when they came to the Capital in those early days, reached that road in the vicinity of Columbus, Ohio, and then proceeded eastward. The road plan of our country has kept the States tied together more than any other one thing.

The reason I asked my question of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, who has done such a magnificent job relative to the road bill, was that I wanted to impress on the Members of the Senate the long period of time it will take for us to complete the interstate system, which is the basic system of transportation in our country.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from Pennsylvania properly emphasizes the point that we must step up the program if we are to get the interstate system completed in time for any of us to use it. It is true of course that the application of funds from the primary system and also from the urban system can speed it up.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania with respect to the importance of the transportation system of this country. In my opinion nothing has united the several States more than have the roads. In the Constitution and in documents and papers the term "United States of America" is used. What actually unites the United States is its roads.

I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota a few questions about the pending bill. First, I wish to compliment him on presenting one of the finest road bills that has ever been reported to the Senate. That is the opinion of the senior Senator from New Mexico, with reference to the bill itself. I differ,

however, with the chairman of the committee and with the chairman of the subcommittee on the use of the interstate funds. Is it not a fact that up to this time, up to the time of the presentation of the pending bill, interstate money was divided under the old system, starting in 1916, on the basis of one-third population, one-third area, and one-third postal road mileage?

Mr. CASE. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. Is it not correct also that under the bill, in which the authorization for interstate roads is lifted from \$25 million to \$150 million, the former formula has been completely ignored, and that the additional \$75 million will be divided, according to the new system, on the basis of population. Is that correct?

Mr. CASE. I would not say it was completely ignored, because section 21 applies to one-half of the amount. Whereas the State of New Mexico, under the three-way division, received \$407,000, under the current authorization of \$75 million divided on the old basis, New Mexico will receive \$1,228,000, and out of the other \$75 million it will receive an additional \$552,000. So that the State of New Mexico, for example, will get \$1,780,000 for its interstate highways, as against \$407,000 at the present time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is under the present \$25 million figure. Let us refer to the \$150 million authorization contained in the bill, and consider it from the standpoint of New Mexico and Idaho.

Under section 21, of the \$150 million authorized by this bill, New Mexico would be allocated \$2,457,000. Under the committee bill, by the division it provides, New Mexico would get \$1,780,000, or \$677,000 less than we would get under the old formula. Let us take South Dakota, if we may, instead of Idaho. Under the old formula, South Dakota would get \$2,359,000. Under the new formula it would get \$1,732,000, or \$627,000 less.

I am not arguing the merits of the bill. However, does not the bill go further, so far as the interstate roads are concerned, in that, besides this division, at least 35 percent of the urban money goes to interstate roads, outside this particular amount. Is that not correct?

Mr. CASE. That would depend upon where the State highway commission applied its highway money.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is what it would do. The term interstate roads means exactly what it says. I am not arguing about the merits of the proposal. But is it not the purpose of the bill to take care of the heavily populated areas, instead of taking care of the interstate mileage?

Mr. CASE. The Senator from South Dakota cannot go quite that far.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In the State of Delaware, for example, there may be 25 miles of interstate roads, and in Rhode Island there may be 40 miles of interstate roads. In any one of the Western States—Utah, for example—there may be thousands of miles of interstate roads. Should not that fact be considered in coming to a solution as to how the interstate money should be used? I know what the Sen-

ator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from South Dakota have in mind with respect to constructing the interstate system as soon as it can be constructed, and I agree with them.

Mr. CASE. The sad truth is that if the interstate money should be apportioned strictly under the old formula of a three-way split, some States would have their interstate systems built long before they were completed in the other States. The adoption of the compromise formula is an attempt to complete the interstate system in all the States at about the same time. It will not be possible to do it, but the bill does move somewhat in that direction.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, while the Senator is on that point, may I invite his attention to page 6 of the Annual Report of the Bureau of Public Roads, which I hope he has before him. I read from the third sentence, beginning on page 6, as follows:

In a survey of the condition of rural portions of the interstate system it was found that only 24 percent of the mileage was adequate for traffic and 76 percent was in need of improvement or reconstruction. On 16 percent of the mileage the need was considered critical.

I point that out to show that on the rural mileage of the interstate system throughout the Nation, according to the report filed for the fiscal year 1953, there is a tremendous need for construction funds. That need is not entirely congested around cities or in States containing large cities. In a real interstate system highways have to traverse large States.

I shall not further take the Senator's time, but I wanted to bring that point to his attention.

Mr. CASE. It is a very good point. There is certainly need for construction of rural mileage under the interstate system, but we should examine into what it will cost to get the job done in rural areas as well as in cities. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] has already stated in the RECORD that South Dakota will receive \$600,000 less if we follow the formula in the report than it would under the old formula. I do not object to that. The subject must be approached from a national standpoint and not from a State standpoint.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Is it not true that under the bill, the secondary road system and Federal aid to the secondary road system receive maximum consideration with reference to local needs and local developments, whereas under the interstate system the bill reported by the committee maximizes the national character and need of trunk lines, giving to the Nation an integrated national system of first-class highways?

Mr. CASE. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator see any immediate reason why the same formula which applies admirably to secondary roads should be applied to interstate roads?

Mr. CASE. The formula should reflect the purpose of the legislation.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield further?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from South Dakota makes clear that the same formula does not apply to secondary roads as to primary roads.

Mr. CASE. The formula for both primary and secondary roads is that one-third is apportioned among the States on the basis of population, one-third on the basis of mileage, and one-third on the basis of area.

Mr. STENNIS. Is it not true that one-third is based on rural population?

Mr. CASE. The formula with respect to secondary roads is based on the mileage of rural delivery and star routes, with the difference which the Senator has well pointed out.

THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY FUND FORMULA

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The formula would not apply on an equal basis, considering population. The population factor takes into account the amount of money needed for the primary system. The population is much greater in the large cities than in farming areas. If the intent of Congress is still being carried out in the secondary system, the only thing we do when we change the formula is to give advantage to a more thickly populated State over a thinly populated State.

Mr. CASE. Let it be clearly understood that we are not changing the formula of the primary system or of the secondary system.

Mr. MALONE. But we are changing the formula when we come to building roads with Federal aid. The system was established in the first instance to bring to the more thinly populated areas a proper proportion of the funds considering the Government land ownership with the consequent smaller population.

To change the formula, however small the appropriation to which it is applicable lays the groundwork for an extension of it next year.

Mr. CASE. We are not changing the formula of the secondary system or of the Federal primary system.

Mr. MALONE. But we are as to a part of the appropriation.

Mr. CASE. No.

Mr. MALONE. How much of it?

Mr. CASE. We are changing it with respect to \$75 million out of a billion dollars.

Mr. MALONE. In any case, we are changing the formula, and the amount is relatively unimportant, because it may be increased as time goes on. We are setting a formula to be followed in the future.

Mr. CASE. For what?

Mr. MALONE. For a part of the Federal road system.

Mr. CASE. No; we are not. We are changing it only as to one-half of the interstate system.

Mr. MALONE. But it is a part of the Federal road system, and it is so designated in the authorization, is it not?

Mr. CASE. It is a part of the interstate system.

Mr. MALONE. Yes. And the interstate system is a part of the Federal highway system for which this Federal participation was inaugurated in the first place.

Mr. CASE. But that is quite different from the Federal secondary system or the other portions of the Federal primary system.

Mr. MALONE. I did not refer either to the secondary system or to the primary system. What I said was that we are setting a precedent whereby a greater proportion of the money would be allotted to the thickly populated States than they would receive under the system under which we have been operating.

Mr. CASE. I point out to the distinguished Senator from Nevada that in an effort to protect the secondary system, the committee did the very best it could with respect to the allocation of the total funds. Under the bill as passed by the House, the authorization for Federal primary, secondary, and urban roads was increased from \$550 million to only \$600 million; a total of \$200 million was applied to the interstate system to be distributed under the new formula. We rejected that in the Senate committee and decided to increase the amount of money not merely to \$600 million, but to \$760 million. Where the House bill would have provided only \$180 million for the Federal secondary system, we have provided \$200 million and have provided for its allocation according to the old formula. Where the House would have authorized only \$270 million for Federal primary roads, we authorize \$342 million, and that also is to be allotted on the basis of the present formula.

Mr. MALONE. I understand that we are establishing a new formula which can be expanded by a future Congress on the basis of precedent. The one we now have we have operated under for approximately 40 years and it has been found extremely satisfactory.

Mr. CASE. Yes; and we are living in a new age, I may say to the Senator from Nevada. I came from a hearing this morning before the Committee on Armed Services, where Admiral Strauss and Admiral Radford spoke to us in terms of the age in which we are living, an age when a hydrogen bomb can blast cities such as Washington completely to pieces.

So we are trying to present to the Senate and to the American people a highway bill which takes cognizance of the age in which we are living, and which will provide for the construction of highways that will facilitate the movement of large volumes of traffic into and out of cities, a highway system which will make it possible to transport more military goods across the country on the interstate system.

Mr. MALONE. I am very glad to hear the Senator from South Dakota is proposing to do that; but if he would study the situation a little further, he might find that over ranges of mountains like the Sierra Nevadas there are single roads of two lanes which probably would become impassable or congested for

many hours after a bomb threat or actual explosion had happened in San Francisco. Therefore, it is just as important to expend more money on the Federal-aid system, the primary interstate system, as on any other part of the program. I think I have some idea of the new age. We are now considering that very problem in the committee of which I am a member—chairman of the subcommittee. The Secretary of State just left the committee, and he is one of the most prominent men in the world when it comes to a discussion of the new age.

It has long been the opinion of the junior Senator from Nevada that the taxpayers of this Nation have been taken for a ride on the various schemes of worldwide expenditure of money.

Mr. CASE. May I invite the attention of the Senator from Nevada to the table appearing on page 66 of the hearings?

Mr. MALONE. The Senator from Nevada is already familiar with it.

Mr. CASE. That is where his problem is answered, because it shows the cost of the work necessary to complete the interstate system.

In the State of Nevada, the percentage of cost to complete the interstate system is 0.17 percent. That is, 2 roads across Nevada, 1 down at the tip, and the other across the wider part of Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. The secondary system is not shown.

Mr. CASE. No. We are discussing only the interstate system, so far as the changed formula is concerned. Seventy-five million dollars will be apportioned on the basis of section 21. The State of Nevada will receive 1.31 percent of the amount provided in the \$75 million.

It will receive 0.75 percent under the other \$75 million.

The State of Nevada will get, in terms of percentage of interstate money, about 8 or 9 times the percentage of the cost of the interstate system that will be required to complete the interstate system in Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The purpose of the Federal highway system is to assist all of the States in an interstate system of highways. We are not talking about Nevada alone, or South Dakota or Rhode Island alone. As the Senator from South Dakota has said, new emergencies may arise in the future. Therefore, I merely called attention to the highway across the Sierra Nevada Mountains, to show that a State such as Nevada, and perhaps even California, could not furnish the amount of money which would be necessary to build a four-lane highway, tunnel, or any other adequate transportation necessary to get the people of coast areas to an inland State or an inland area whenever the emergency happened in Sacramento or San Francisco or any other large population center.

During the first session of the 83d Congress, the 2 Senators from California and the 2 Senators from Nevada

introduced a special bill to provide funds with which to construct a 4-lane highway across the Sierra Nevada Mountains. That is only one project. There are, no doubt, hundreds of similar projects in the United States.

The formula for the interstate highways is working very well and in about the right proportion. There are 160,000 people in Nevada, and about 10 million in California. But it is estimated that if a bomb hit San Francisco, or if San Francisco or Los Angeles were threatened, the population of Nevada, provided the roads would carry the people, would be increased not merely by a few thousand, but maybe by several times, in a very short period. So the roads which are needed to evacuate the people from large population centers are not simply roads leading from the cities, but to their destination. I point out to the Senator from South Dakota that when a million people leave an area, they are going somewhere. They are simply not moving into the suburbs.

In the West, where the Senator from South Dakota also lives—and he should know something about these conditions—it is necessary to complete a road to the destination, to where the people are going, to where there are water facilities and sewage facilities. Most of Nevada and eastern California is a dry area. People cannot stop just anywhere. It is necessary for them to move on to places where they can live normally and where food is available.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would the Senator from Nevada please speak a little louder, so that other Senators may hear his part of the discussion?

Mr. MALONE. The junior Senator from Nevada has about completed what he intended to say.

I still do not understand why it is necessary to change the formula when there is little change in the overall or complete need.

Mr. CASE. The committee wanted to help the people who desired to go into the State of Nevada, so we changed the formula in another direction. We provided matching. It is only necessary to put up, in a State which now matches on a 50-50 basis, about 40 cents out of a dollar, and the Federal Government will put up 60 cents. The State of Nevada would receive a better deal. Whereas other States would put up 50 cents on a dollar, Nevada would put up only a little more than 15 cents, because the Federal Government, because of the public lands in Nevada, would put up 84.14 cents out of each dollar. That applies also to the 60-40 provision. We have provided that on the interstate system the Federal Government will put up 60 cents, and the State of Nevada will put up 40 cents out of the dollar.

Mr. MALONE. Instead of 50 cents?

Mr. CASE. Instead of 50 cents.

Mr. MALONE. That will not help a thinly populated State such as Nevada.

Mr. CASE. Yes, it will help Nevada, because, in the application of the 60-40 ratio, it will take into consideration the public lands. So on the interstate system, the State of Nevada will put up

about 13 cents, and Uncle Sam will put up 87 cents.

Mr. MALONE. That is another pain to the Western States, because of the control which has been asserted over public lands by the Department of the Interior for more than 20 years. Eighty-seven percent of the land in Nevada is under the supervision of the Department of the Interior, and we in Nevada do not like that. For 22 years the policy has been that the public owns these lands and is entitled to the income from them. So the Government rents the lands to the stockmen and charges all the traffic will bear. Then the Federal Government distributes the money to the entire public throughout the 48 States.

But that is another question which may be debated at length on the Senate floor at some future time. However, so long as the Government insists on holding those lands, and no method has been worked out and approved by Congress to put those lands in the hands of the private owners and taxpayers in family-sized units, then why object to the provision that a State, with every acre of it in taxable property, except Government monuments or parks, must put up 50 percent? Even when every acre is taxed, they get 50 percent free in matching funds, and they only match the additional 50 percent.

In Nevada and, of course, in other public land States, where there is a much lesser amount of land privately owned, the same condition prevails. What the bill does then, when we finally add it up, is to encroach on the initial formula and set a precedent for penalizing the States where the Government owns the major part of the land.

The original formula compensated, at least in part, for that condition.

Mr. CASE. This might be a good place to point out, also, that the bill reported by the Senate committee increases the funds for forest highways, roads, and trails, for park roads and parkways, for Indian roads, and public land roads. The House bill would continue such authorizations as they are at present. The Senate bill increases each of those by from 10 to 15 percent, according to the various funds.

Mr. MALONE. I think that is a very laudable thing to do, but it has nothing to do with the initial formula or the way in which it has been changed.

Mr. CASE. There are some other special features of the bill to which I desire to call attention very briefly; then I shall yield the floor. One feature is with respect to secondary roads. It was the feeling of many persons who came before the committee that the States should be afforded greater latitude in the application of their secondary highway money. So the committee adopted language proposed by the House, with some modifications. It appears on page 3 of the bill, as follows:

Provided further, That in the case of those sums apportioned to any State for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system, the Secretary of Commerce may discharge his responsibility relative to the plans, design, inspection, and construction of such secondary road projects by his receiving and approving a certified statement by

the State highway department setting forth that the plans, design, and construction for such projects are in accord with the standards and procedures of the respective States applicable to projects in this category approved by him in accordance with the objectives set forth in section 1 (b) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, and containing satisfactory assurances that such projects will be maintained in accordance with existing law.

The general movement, which has been endorsed by highway officials in a majority of the States, that the States should have a greater voice in secondary projects, was written into the bill in the House. But in the Senate committee we have added language to make it clear that the objectives of the project shall be substantially those set forth in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1950; and further there is set forth a specific requirement that those certifications shall include a statement that the projects will be maintained by the States.

The States are given much greater latitude than they had previously in the handling of secondary highway funds. I think it is the feeling of the Bureau of Public Roads that the bill will relieve them of some of their responsibility, and will result in a considerable saving of administrative funds, and will permit the States to vary the designs of roads according to the traffic needs. In some States secondary roads seem to have the same traffic needs as primary roads, but in other States the traffic on secondary roads varies a great deal.

There is another provision in the bill on "Studies." It proposes that the Bureau of Public Roads, or the Secretary of Commerce through the Commissioner of Public Roads, shall study the problem of highway financing, including that of toll roads.

The bill also requires that the Bureau shall engage in a program of research designed to determine which materials will improve the quality of roads and the number of roads the Government will get for its money. The research provision is a broad one. It is one adapted from a suggestion by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] in the bill which he introduced. We are hopeful that it will yield real benefit for the consideration of the committee in the next highway act.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN. Will not the research also include a study of soil conditions, and materials which could be used to best advantage in the various States; not only materials which are used in building roads, but consideration of the soil conditions, drainage, and factors of that kind, which have to do with the construction of permanent highways?

Mr. CASE. It is true that the provision with regard to research is very broad, and that it includes what the Senator from Pennsylvania has so well pointed out.

Another provision which appears in the Senate bill and not in the House bill, which has attracted considerable

interest, is section 13, which appears on page 12 of the bill and reads as follows:

At any time that the President may determine that the level of national employment is such as to warrant an increase in the volume of highway construction, he is hereby authorized to advance the effective date of any authorizations in this act, except the authorization in sections 7 and 8, to a date not more than 1 year earlier than the dates which would otherwise become effective.

Sections 7 and 8 refer to the Inter-American Highway and the so-called Rama Road.

With respect to authorizations in the bill for the Federal aid systems to the States, or for the building of roads on Federal lands, the President, by this paragraph in the bill, would be authorized to advance the authorization date by a year. In other words, the authorization for 1956 could be made available following July 1, 1954, which would begin the fiscal year 1955.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN. Does that not bring into effect the principle which a great number of people have advocated over the years, that the time to have public works is when there is unemployment and a lesser amount of what we call private business than in the ordinary years, because the public then would get more to show for its dollars than in the years when there exists large employment and large business enterprises?

Mr. CASE. The Senator from Pennsylvania is correct. It might be noted that the Council of Economic Advisers has stated that in a public-works program, roads should come first. Roads would extend their doorways to every portion of the country and would be a constructive project because we would have something to show for the money spent.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

Mr. CASE. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota a question. Is it not a fact that the interstate system is just a part of the primary road system?

Mr. CASE. Yes, I suppose it could be said that all of the interstate system is part of the primary system, but the primary system is larger than the interstate system.

Mr. CHAVEZ. When funds are being discussed for interstate roads, why should particular attention be paid to 3 or 4 States, instead of to the country as a whole?

Mr. CASE. We are not paying attention to only 3 or 4 States; we are paying attention to the problem of getting the interstate system completed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is no difference between building a two-lane road in New Mexico and one in Connecticut, so far as costs are concerned. There is no difference between building a four-lane road in Colorado and one in Pennsylvania. Is it not correct to say that by the proposed legislation we would be

asking 29 States of the Union to sacrifice themselves, so far as their revenues are concerned, in order to please 11 or 12 States?

Mr. CASE. The Senator from South Dakota cannot quite accept the statement of the Senator from New Mexico, because I am sure an examination of the source of the revenues would hardly justify the statement that we are asking 29 States to dig up for the other States. As a matter of fact, I think the formula proposed will more nearly return revenues to the States of origin than would be the case under the old formula.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not correct to say that the original bill introduced by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works contains a new formula?

Mr. CASE. That is correct. The Senator from South Dakota voted with the Senator in the committee because he was looking at the situation from the standpoint of South Dakota, I suppose. Having increased the funds for secondary and primary roads to the extent we did, the Senator from South Dakota thought we had done a fair job for the States as a whole, and recognized the proposal of the interstate system as a suggestion of a system of national highways, and so he was constrained to support the bill reported by the subcommittee.

There are a couple of other special provisions in the bill upon which I should like to comment. One is the cost of relocation of utilities. We probably had more testimony on the cost of utility relocation than on any other new subject. The committee received many letters and statements, and many witnesses appeared before the committee on the subject. We also had many telephone calls, because telephone companies were also interested. The cost of utility relocation is particularly burdensome when it falls upon municipalities or small utility companies such as telephone, gas, electric, and water companies. But the problem we had was that we were being asked to have Uncle Sam take over the cost of the utility relocations in States where the State legislatures themselves refused to recognize such costs as fair costs of such projects.

In that connection, the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] made a suggestion.

At this point, let me say, parenthetically, that I regretted I was called to the railroad station yesterday afternoon, and could not be in the Chamber to join in the tributes which we paid to his integrity, his very fine service, and his high character, and to have expressed my personal regret at his decision to retire.

Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado suggested to the bill an amendment to which the committee gave consideration. That amendment proposed that the Federal Government pay the utility relocation costs out of the Federal aid funds, up to 5 percent. A study was made by the League of Municipalities—I believe that was the name

of the organization—which determined that the average cost of utility relocations amounted to 4.81 percent of the cost of projects—which seems very high.

I suggested to the committee, as a compromise, that we recognize one-half of the cost of such relocations, and permit up to 3 percent of the funds apportioned to any particular project to be used to liquidate that cost. But we encountered the argument that it seemed hardly justifiable for the United States Government to pay utility relocation costs in States where the State legislatures had refused to recognize those costs as part of the fair costs of the projects.

Under present law, if a State recognizes the cost of relocating a gas main, or a telephone line, or any other public utility as a fair part of the cost of such a project, then it is submitted to the Bureau of Public Roads; and the Federal Government pays its proportionate share of the total cost of the project. The committee felt that in view of that fact, we should not go further at this time.

So the bill contains a provision requiring that a study be made of that particular subject by the Bureau of Public Roads, and that the results of the study be submitted to the committee at the earliest possible date, for consideration in connection with the next highway bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado rose.

Mr. CASE. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

First, Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from South Dakota for the nice things he has said about me personally and about my retirement. I wish to say to him that my decision not to seek reelection was one of the hardest decisions I have ever made, and the hardest one which I believe I shall ever be called upon to make. Of course, one never knows whether he will be reelected, but I decided not to seek reelection.

Mr. CASE. Most of us had a suspicion that if the Senator from Colorado wished to be reelected, he would be.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I appreciate what the Senator from South Dakota says.

Mr. CASE. That is considerable candor for a Republican.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from South Dakota has been very kind to me. I recall, too, with a great deal of satisfaction and pleasure, that in the closing days of the 80th Congress, a great favor was done to me and to the State of Colorado, when the Senator from South Dakota made it possible for the first woman superintendent of the Denver Mint to occupy that office. She rendered very capable and splendid service; and the women of Colorado especially appreciate what the Senator from South Dakota did in regard to that matter.

Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota has discussed the amendment I submitted and the study which is to be made. I should like to have his attention and also the attention—as I know

I shall—of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], who is in charge of the bill.

Section 10 of Senate bill 3184 directs that a study be made of the problem of reimbursing from Federal funds the costs incurred by publicly owned and privately owned utilities in relocating their facilities in order to accommodate Federal-aid highways. However, on page 13 of the committee's report, in paragraph 2, the following statement is made; and it is with reference to that statement that I am anxious to have the attention of the members of the committee:

It is clear that such inequities as may exist are due to relationships between the utilities and the State or local governments rather than relationships with the Federal Government. It would seem neither feasible nor desirable for the Federal Government to give direction to those local relationships by force of application of Federal funds.

I understand that language reflects the views expressed by the Commissioner of Public Roads, in opposition to the proposal of the utility owners and operators. If the language I have just read or any other portion of the report amounts to a prejudgment of the issues presented, then the making of the study, at considerable expense in time and funds to the governmental agencies and utilities, would appear to be useless.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President—

Mr. CASE. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN. Let me suggest to the Senator from South Dakota that if the next paragraph of the report is read, I think it may answer the question of the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CASE. And in that connection I hope the Senator from Colorado will read the last sentence, particularly, of the following paragraph.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have read it, and I am not entirely satisfied with it. I do not know that I completely understand it in the way the members of the committee do.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, in connection with that matter, I should like to read into the RECORD the sentence to which attention has just been directed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. CASE. It is as follows:

The committee feels, however, that it would be helpful to have a thorough study and analysis of all factors relating to this problem, including estimates of costs and analyses of existing State laws and regulations. It has therefore approved language calling for such a study, with a report to be made to the President for transmittal to Congress not later than February 1, 1955.

That is an early date.

The report at this point concludes with the following:

It is expected that this study will be conducted on the basis of impartial facts and objectivity.

Mr. President, I do not recall any personal expression of opinion by the Commissioner of Public Roads in regard to this matter. I think I could probably find it.

In any event, whatever his personal opinion may be, let me say clearly and definitely for the record what the committee report says:

It is expected that this study will be conducted on the basis of impartial facts and objectivity.

It is not to be a study with any intent to come to an anticipated conclusion; but the study is designed to develop the facts, in order to find out, under the various State laws, what the costs would be if the Federal Government were to take some direct action in this regard, to ascertain what the relationships are, to explore the subject, and to make a report not later than February 1, 1955.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am pleased to have the Senator from South Dakota say that, because if a fair and impartial study of the problem is to be made, I think it would be most unfortunate for the position of either side to the controversy to be prejudiced or encouraged. I think we must approach the matter with a completely open mind. That is what I was worried about when I read into the RECORD the paragraph to which I referred a moment ago.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield at this point, so that I may make, for the RECORD, a statement along the same line?

Mr. CASE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course.

Mr. HOLLAND. Speaking as one of the minority members of the subcommittee which studied this matter, I wish to assure the distinguished Senator from Colorado that it was our understanding that the study would be objective and impartial, and would be made for the purpose of informing the committee of what could be done. So far as the senior Senator from Florida is concerned, he was rather surprised when he saw the earlier wording which has been read, and which appears in this particular part of the report, but he assumes that that is simply the expression of what the committee would have had to do at this stage without further information about the situation which developed, which was this: The State laws were so different, and the study we had made was so imperfect that there was no clear road open at that stage, and we were asking for a complete study to be made, and a report to be made available, in the hope that there would be a clear road open by which we could bring some relief in the situation which is disturbing the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. And without any preconceived conclusion or prejudice of any kind.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Colorado is correct. We would have had to act adversely, I think, if we had acted on the basis of such imperfect information as we had at the time. I prefer to consider the earlier recitals in this particular section of the report as simply reflecting that fact. I think the

later recitals, in which we ask for information, and in which we ask the Senate to add to the bill a provision for a study and report, are the real meat of the finding of the committee. We needed light, and felt that this was the way to get it. If such light should show us the way by which we could properly make relief available, I believe the committee would not hesitate to provide it.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from South Dakota appreciates the additional statement of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. One other matter which disturbed the Senator from Colorado is the fact that in his testimony in response to the questions which were propounded to the Commissioner of Public Roads, he seemed to indicate a particular, definite conclusion with respect to the entire subject. I should like to ask Senators if they would object to an amendment to section 10 of Senate bill 3184 which would direct the Secretary of Commerce, rather than the Commissioner of Public Roads, to conduct the study proposed in section 9 of the companion House bill. Are Senators wedded to the idea that the Commissioner of Public Roads should make the proposed study? I am afraid the Commissioner is prejudiced. I gain that impression from what he said before the committee, as contained in the record of hearings.

Mr. CASE. Frankly, I do not know whether the words "Commissioner of Public Roads" were used selectively or not, but I ask the Senator from Colorado if he thinks he would be in any better position if the study were made by the Secretary of Commerce than if it were made by the Commissioner of Public Roads.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think it would be better if it were made by the Secretary of Commerce rather than by the Commissioner of Public Roads, because, in my opinion, the Commissioner of Public Roads is in many instances a party to the controversies which are involved. Probably it is to be expected that he should be prejudiced. He lives within a small empire. The building of roads is a small empire, and he is a party to it. I should like to see the study made by someone who is not so intimately involved in the subject to be studied as is the Commissioner of Public Roads.

Mr. CASE. Speaking only for myself as one member of the committee, personally I should have no objection to the change. However, I should wish to consult with other members of the committee. There may be some reason for having the study made by the Commissioner of Public Roads. Generally speaking, it may be said that there has been considerable freedom in using the Secretary of Commerce and the Commissioner of Public Roads interchangeably. That practice runs through Federal highway legislation over a period of years. The Secretary of Commerce is referred to in this bill because the Bureau of Public Roads is in the Department of Commerce. At one time the Bureau was an independent agency. At another it was in the Department of Agriculture. At one time it was a part of the Federal Works Agency.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Do I correctly understand that there would be no objection to an amendment to section 10 so as to provide for the study to be made by the Secretary of Commerce rather than by the Commissioner of Public Roads?

Mr. CASE. So far as the Senator from South Dakota is personally concerned, he has no objection. However, before agreeing to an amendment of that sort I should like to confer with the chairman of the Public Works Committee and the ranking members on the minority side.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator. I hope he will confer with the chairman and the other members of the committee.

Mr. CASE. In any event, whatever the language may be, let it be clearly understood that what we want is an impartial objective study.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is a very refreshing statement. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Before the Senator from Colorado leaves the Chamber, let me say to him that I concur in what the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has said relative to the proposed study. It is the intention of the committee that a thorough, impartial study be made of this subject. The committee was very much confused by some of the testimony which it received. It makes no difference to me whether the study is to be made by the Secretary of Commerce or the Commissioner of Public Roads.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO

While I am on my feet, let me say that I did not have the privilege of being present yesterday afternoon when several of my colleagues spoke relative to the services of our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Colorado. I wish to say publicly that I am extremely sorry the distinguished Senator from Colorado has seen fit to remove himself from this body. I agree with the Senator from South Dakota. I believe that if the Senator from Colorado were to be a candidate he would be reelected. I have served with him on the Finance Committee since coming to the Senate. I appreciate our association very much. The Senator from Colorado has helped me on numerous occasions. My prayer is that he and his fine wife may enjoy many more years of health and happiness.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his very generous and warm-hearted statement. It has been a great pleasure for me to serve with him. I have found him to be one of the great patriots of our time.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. CASE. I yield. I wish to yield to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], but I understand that the Senator from Kansas wishes further to develop the theme of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the fine work of the Senator from Colorado has been praised by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. I concur in his statement.

The Senator from Colorado was born 13 miles from my hometown. He is truly a Kansan. We have watched with great pride the progress he has made in the field of public service in the adjoining State of Colorado. It was a privilege to work with him during my service in the House, which goes back to 1935, while he was in the Senate, and it has been, perhaps, even a greater privilege to be associated with him in the Senate. We in Kansas will miss his fine service in the Senate, but I feel that he and his good wife are entitled to a very well-deserved rest, after he has served his State and the Nation so faithfully and well.

I say to the distinguished Senator from Colorado that it has been a pleasure to know him as a friend, as a legislator, and as a neighbor. I wish for him and his good wife the very best that life can afford.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kansas for the very kind things he has said. I used to call the Senator from Kansas "my Congressman," because he represented so ably the district in Kansas of which I am a native. Our homes were not too far apart, although I lived in my home much earlier than the Senator from Kansas lived in his home. However, I referred to him with a great deal of affection and pride as "my Congressman." I thank the Senator for what he has said.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleagues in expressing to the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado our sorrow at his leaving this great body. I may say to the Senator from Colorado that the Mountain States of the West will regret very much his leaving the Senate. He has been a great force in the development of the West for a long period of time.

I first became acquainted with him when he was Lieutenant Governor of Colorado, and I knew him later also when he was the Governor of the State. Of course, I have known him since he has been a Member of this body. He has cooperated on every occasion in the enactment of legislation that would enhance the development of our great West.

We are truly sorry that he is leaving the service of his country in the capacity of a Senator, but we hope that in the years that lie ahead he will enjoy living out in God's country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his very generous remarks. I was a resident of the State of Wyoming for a few years a long time ago—I presume before the Senator from Wyoming was born—

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator very much for the compliment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I enjoyed living in Wyoming. Colorado and Wyoming are very close together. The people of the two States mingle very closely. I have enjoyed serving with the junior Senator from Wyoming in the Senate. I watched his career when he was in the House, and I have attended hearings he has held at Grand Junction and at other places in Colorado on Forest Service bills. I regard him as one of my favorite people, and I thank him for what he has said about me.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President—

Mr. CASE. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I regret that I was not in the Chamber yesterday when so many tributes were paid to our distinguished friend and colleague from Colorado. I wish to associate myself with the remarks previously made about the long and distinguished career of Senator JOHNSON.

I had the privilege of serving for 4 years on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy with the Senator from Colorado. I know of his tremendous contributions to that all-important work.

I also had the privilege of working with Senator JOHNSON, during the time that I served in the House of Representatives, in connection with many of the great power and reclamation projects in the West.

We who come from the West and from the Far West will miss his invaluable counsel. I do not know of anyone who has made a greater contribution to the cause of the West than has Senator JOHNSON of Colorado.

His typical western independence has lent great strength to this all-important legislative body.

I wish to join with my many colleagues in wishing Senator JOHNSON and his good wife all of the best as they return to the great State of Colorado.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I, too, wish to join with my colleagues in expressing my regrets that the distinguished and honored Senator from Colorado sees fit to seek retirement.

As a new Member of the Senate it has been my good fortune to serve with him on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, a committee which has great responsibility and great authority in recommending legislation concerning the regulatory agencies of our Government. I know of no man in or out of Congress who has a better knowledge of and a keener interest in this large segment of our Government. I have called upon the distinguished and honored Senator many times for advice. His counsel has been widely sought, and he is a man whom we all hold in high esteem.

I sincerely hope that Mrs. Johnson and the Senator will enjoy many years of happiness and health.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am pleased that we in New Mexico know Senator JOHNSON about as well as any neighbor could know him. Not only do we know him well, but we know him in good faith. We have followed his political career for many years.

I am glad in a way that he is retiring. He and his wonderful wife are entitled to the good things of life, and I know he will appreciate being a free man again.

I have only one regret, Mr. President. I have so many Republican relatives in Colorado who have voted for him as a Democrat that I do not know how they will vote in the future.

I wish the Senator all the best.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wish to express my very warm appreciation to the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], and to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] for their very generous and kind remarks.

THE HIGHWAY BILL

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi was called to the telephone a short time ago and did not hear the Senator from South Dakota speak with reference to the utility survey. So far as I am concerned, it is my recollection that we did not have sufficient facts before us in the committee—and I believe that view was shared by the whole membership of the committee—on which to base any judgment in which from a factual standpoint we could feel secure. Was that the Senator's position on that point?

Mr. CASE. The point the Senator from Mississippi makes was the view accepted by the committee. We felt we did not have sufficient facts to enable us to take affirmative action, and, therefore, we wanted a study made. The Senator from Colorado was concerned lest some language in one of the paragraphs of the report prejudged the study. It was the intention of the members of the committee that we should have the kind of study made which is referred to in the final sentence of that section of the report dealing with utility relocations:

It is expected that this study will be conducted on the basis of impartial facts and objectivity.

Mr. STENNIS. I have read that part of the report, and I believe the concluding sentence in that section makes it clear that what we wanted and what we expected was a factual study and a factual report, because that is what we need on which to base action. I appreciate the Senator's statement.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, there is only one additional section, section 17, which appears at page 13 of the bill. I ask unanimous consent that it may appear in my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, section 17 of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Sec. 17. (a) Highway construction work performed in pursuance of agreements between the Secretary of Commerce and any State highway department which requires approval by the Secretary of Commerce and which is financed in whole or in part by funds authorized under this or succeeding acts, shall be performed by contract awarded by competitive bidding under such procedures as may by regulations be prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce, unless the Secretary of Commerce shall affirmatively find that, under the circumstances relating to a given project, some other method is in the public interest. All such findings shall be reported promptly in writing to the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

(b) In any case in which approval by the Secretary of Commerce of any contract for such highway construction work is required, the Secretary shall require as a condition precedent to such approval a sworn statement executed by, or on behalf of, the person, firm, association, or corporation to whom such contract is to be awarded, certifying that such person, firm, association, or corporation has not, either directly or indirectly, entered into any agreement, participated in any collusion, or otherwise taken any action in restraint of free competitive bidding in connection with such contract.

Mr. CASE. I merely wish to point out that this is a new section in Federal highway legislation. Very briefly, it provides that any contracts awarded to accomplish projects authorized by this or any succeeding acts shall be awarded on a competitive bidding basis, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of Commerce may prescribe.

It specifically provides that when a contract is awarded the Secretary of Commerce shall require, "as a condition precedent to the approval of a contract, a sworn statement, executed by" the appropriate person in behalf of the contractor, "certifying that such person, firm, association, or corporation has not, either directly or indirectly, entered into any agreement, participated in any collusion, or otherwise taken any action in restraint of free competitive bidding in connection with such contract."

Mr. President, in point of dollars, this is the largest of the Federal aid bills which have been presented to the Congress. The committee felt it was only proper that competitive bidding should be required in order to obtain the maximum number of roads in quality and quantity for the dollars spent. Therefore, Mr. President, that provision was included in section 17, and it is commended to the Senate.

In conclusion, I merely wish to say that the bill was reported by the committee with a wholehearted endorsement, for we believe that the dollars spent under this bill are an investment in America which will yield both private and public income for all time to come.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, it should be apparent that the continuing deterioration of the Nation's highways constitutes an acute problem which must be met as early as possible. The breakdown of the highway systems is a threat to the economy of the Nation which is

recognized by all authorities on the subject. This measure more nearly approximates the need for funds which were previously used to meet the burdens of defense expenditures. The use of a greater share of the revenues raised from taxes on gasoline, diesel fuel, and motor oil for Federal aid to highways is consistent with the urging of the administration for a return to a constructive program in a peace with prosperity approach. It has been my belief for some time that we should get on with this type of work which is neither wasteful nor synthetic, in solving as it does problems which become most costly as the deterioration progresses further.

I am pleased that the committee recognized the need for a greater share of these tax funds for transfer to the States in bringing the means for meeting the financial burdens of road building to those State highway officials who live closely with the requirements of their local economies. In my State there is a dread of the effect of procrastination on this legislation because delay threatens our industry, its workingmen, the farmers and all others in the State who are in one way or another annoyed by sluggishness in the treatment of this program. I am informed by the president and the executive committee of the American Automobile Association that only 24 percent of the national system of interstate highways meets standards of sufficiency. This note of alarm comes from an association with a membership of 4,250,000 motorists. Motoring in this country is not a matter of luxury today. It is a vital link with the conduct of everyday business. The further breakdown of the system of roads spells jeopardy to our economy.

Mr. President, from reliable witnesses who testified before the Committee on Public Works there has been adduced the interesting fact that 63.8 percent of the mileage on the Federal-aid systems is in need of improvement, and that an ever-increasing gap exists between the maintenance and use of the highways. This figure is shocking, and there is a strong indication that it is climbing to a total that spells disaster. This percentage figure was the result of a survey last year. It is evident that delay has been costly to the point of extravagance.

Two years ago, repairs to this 63.8 percentage of the Federal-aid systems which had become impaired would have cost \$32 billion. It is now estimated that the same work will cost \$3 billion in excess of that figure. What price delay?

It seems to me that we will not have discharged our duty to the public unless we at least create a status of sufficiency for the users of our highways as soon as practicable.

For many years there was some justification for neglect of this dangerous situation. The economy of a war period did not permit attention to be focused on this enormous lag in work which must be done to maintain our basic needs over a long period. This reason for neglecting this work no longer exists. This bill is a step in the right direction and, in my opinion, is the most important and worthwhile legislation to come before us

in years. I implore the aid of all my colleagues to the end that the matter be disposed of and the necessary commitments be made.

Mr. President, at the present time, the Federal tax on gasoline, diesel fuel, and motor oil raises roughly \$1 billion. This bill does not envision the earmarking of taxes from this source but authorizes an appropriation of \$910 million for Federal aid to highways. The declining level of defense expenditures most certainly justifies emphasis at this time on spending for vital construction which takes the place of spending for purely military needs. The public is aware of its urgency and the penalties that would be suffered by postponement of its objectives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 208. An act for the relief of Sister Constantine (Teresia Kakonyi);

S. 532. An act for the relief of Giulio Squillari, Mrs. Maggiorina Barbero Squillari, Rosanna Squillari, and Eugenio Squillari;

S. 939. An act for the relief of Njeh Hovhanissian Aslanian;

S. 1208. An act for the relief of Andrew D. Sumner;

S. 1209. An act for the relief of Dr. Uheng Khoo;

S. 1231. An act for the relief of Franz Gerich and Willy Gerich, his minor son;

S. 1691. An act to authorize Potomac Electric Power Co. to construct, maintain, and operate in the District of Columbia, and to cross Kenilworth Avenue NE., in said District, with, certain railroad tracks and related facilities, and for other purposes;

S. 1937. An act for the relief of Rev. Francis T. Dwyer and Rev. Thomas Morrissey;

S. 2499. An act for the relief of Hua Lin and his wife, Lillian Ching-Wen Lin (nee Hu); and

S. 2534. An act for the relief of Dora Vida Lyew Seixas.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 61) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 238) granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 5529) to preserve within Manassas National Battlefield Park, Va., the most important historic properties relating to the battles of Manassas, and for other purposes.

THE WAR IN INDOCHINA

Mr. KENNEDY obtained the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued April 8, 1954
For actions of April 7, 1954
S3rd-2nd, No. 64

CONTENTS

Acreage allotments.....21	Grains.....16	Property.....7
Animal diseases.....5	Labor, farm.....6	Reclamation.....18
Appropriations.....6	Legislative program.....8	Road authorizations.....1
Banking and currency....13	Livestock.....20	Social security.....10
Dairy industry.....16,19	Loans, farm.....9,15	Soil conservation.....9,21
Foreign affairs.....12	Personnel.....11,14,17	Travel expenses.....3
Forestry.....1,2	Price supports...4,9,16,21	Vehicles.....17
Furniture.....17		

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed road-authorizations bill. Senate committee reported bill to increase maximum per-diem allowance. Sen. Welker withdrew motion to reconsider forest-grazing bill. Rep. Hope introduced bill on emergency farm loans. Rep. Miller, Kans., spoke in favor of insured soil-conservation loans, and he and Rep. Poage criticized flexible price supports. Sen. Humphrey inserted statements against flexible price supports.

SENATE

1. ROAD AUTHORIZATIONS. Passed with amendments H. R. 8127 (in lieu of S. 3184), to authorize road appropriations for the fiscal years 1956 and 1957 (pp. 4487-517). (For provisions of the bill, including forestry items, see Digests 56 and 57.) Senate conferees were appointed.
2. FOREST GRAZING. Sen. Welker withdrew his motion to reconsider the vote on S. 2548, to regulate forest grazing practices, but he said he still believed the bill should have contained additional court-appeal provisions (pp. 4503-4).
3. TRAVEL EXPENSES. The Government Operations Committee reported without amendment S. 3200, to increase from \$9 to \$12 the maximum per-diem allowance in connection with official travel (S. Rept. 1196)(p. 4483).
4. PRICE SUPPORTS. Sen. Humphrey inserted various statements opposing flexible price supports, etc. (pp. 4481-3).
5. ANIMAL DISEASES. Received a Calif. legislature resolution favoring a Mexican boundary fence to protect this country from animal-disease entry (pp. 4478-9).
6. FARM LABOR. H. J. Res. 461, providing an additional appropriation to the Labor Department for the Mexican farm labor program, was brought up at the end of the day, but this action was rescinded (p. 4518).
7. PROPERTY. Both Houses received the State Department report on disposal of excess property overseas (H. Doc. 365)(pp. 4518, 4522).

8. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Knowland said it is expected that the Senate will be in recess from Thurs. afternoon prior to Easter until the following Wed. except for noncontroversial matters to be considered Mon. (p. 4519).

HOUSE

9. FARM LOANS; PRICE SUPPORTS. Rep. Miller, Kans., spoke in favor of his bill, H. R. 8602, providing for Federal guarantee of loans made by private institutions to farmers to carry out approved soil conservation practices; and he and Rep. Poage criticized flexible price supports (pp. 4566-8).
10. SOCIAL SECURITY. Rep. Secrest spoke in favor of extending social security benefits to farmers (pp. 4568-9).
11. PERSONNEL. The Government Operations Committee reported with amendment H. R. 7477, to authorize collection of indebtedness of military and civilian personnel resulting from erroneous payments (H. Rept. 1507)(p. 4572).
12. FOREIGN AFFAIRS. The Government Operations Committee submitted a report on U. S. international operations (H. Rept. 1505)(p. 4572).
13. BANKING AND CURRENCY. Rep. Patman criticized the Administration's hard money policy and discussed a book to be issued Apr. 9, "The Hard Money Crusade" (pp. 4569-71).

BILLS INTRODUCED

14. PERSONNEL. H. R. 8746, by Rep. Forand, to provide for exchange of employees of this Department with those of State political subdivisions or educational institutions; to Agriculture Committee (p. 4572).
15. FARM LOANS. H. R. 8748, by Rep. Hope, "to amend the act of April 6, 1949, as amended by the act of July 14, 1953, to improve the program of emergency loans..."; to Agriculture Committee (p. 4572).
16. PRICE SUPPORTS. H. R. 8750, by Rep. Berry, to limit the reduction in dairy price supports; to Agriculture Committee (p. 4572).
H. R. 8751, by Rep. Bow, to provide that feed grains acquired through price-support operations shall be sold to dairy farmers at prices equivalent to the percentage of parity at which dairy products are being supported; to Agriculture Committee(p. 4572). Remarks of author (p. 4557).
17. VEHICLES. H. R. 8753, by Rep. Jonas, N. C., to authorize GSA to operate motor vehicle pools and to provide office furniture and furnishings when agencies are moved, to direct GSA to report unauthorized use of Government automobiles, and to authorize Civil Service Commission to regulate operators of Government vehicles; to Government Operations Committee (p. 4572).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

18. RECLAMATION. Rep. Saylor inserted a letter from the Budget Bureau raising questions on the upper Colorado River storage project (pp. A2665-6).
19. DAIRY INDUSTRY. Rep. Johnson, Wis., inserted Rep. Whitten's recent speech on some problems of the dairy farmers (pp. A2682-3).
20. LIVESTOCK. Rep. Dolliver inserted an Iowa Development Bulletin, "Iowa Foremost

"I wish to inform you that in agreement with Mr. David Owen I have entrusted Mr. Louis Dolivet, Consultant of the Department of Social Affairs, with the task of preparing and drafting a handbook containing information on nongovernmental organizations having some form of consultative status with the Economic and Social Council.

"Mr. Dolivet will be in touch with you for the gathering of the necessary material and will also arrange, in consultation with the Department of Public Information, for the publication and circulation of this handbook. He will call on your assistance whenever required."

Not knowing that Dolivet was an agent of the Comintern, Dr. White complied with this directive without protest. But 6 months later he felt compelled to send a cable to Paris to his superior officer, Mr. Gilbert Yates, complaining about irrelevancies, important omissions, and lack of scientific approach in Dolivet's introductory chapters for the handbook.

In answer, Mr. Yates called on October 9, 1948, that Dolivet would devote the major part of his time to preparation of the handbook, and that the section in which Dr. White was employed should give [Dolivet] all assistance, including access papers as member Secretariat.

Still ignorant of Dolivet's real role (it was not publicly disclosed until the following summer), Dr. White replied to Yates: "Will cooperate fully."

But soon the differences of opinion between Dolivet and Dr. White grew acute.

Dr. White testified before the Tribunal that Dolivet warned him: "If you criticize my work to others I'll make plenty of trouble for you, and don't you think I can't do it."

On November 30, 1948, Mr. Yates sent a handwritten letter to Dr. White stating in part:

"Again, I could not honestly say your 'official' judgment is a strong point * * * your appreciation of the bearing of international political trends on our work is not good; you may have a natural and easily understandable aversion to the 'political' aspect of matters, but in the U. N. as it has to work it is often necessary to have a greater appreciation of these questions in order to be able to know what is the really correct line."

Yates added that others of Dr. White's senior officers shared this opinion concerning his judgment, and Yates suggested that perhaps Dr. White might find himself better suited to a post elsewhere than in the U. N. Secretariat.

Dr. White continued his criticisms of Dolivet's work.

Careful study of the documents in Dr. White's case leads a researcher to question seriously the reliability of his superior officers' judgment. They hired and backed "Comintern agent" Dolivet. One of them, a Mr. Charles Hogan, bore executive responsibility for the issuance of a press release which caused a scandal at the U. N. because it unduly favored the Communist-dominated World Federation of Trade Unions. More important still, Dr. White's top boss was Mr. David Owen, in whose Department of Economic Affairs—according to charts in the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee report of January 2, 1953—there was the greatest concentration of fifth-amendment United States nationals.

After the Dolivet episode and other incidents involving White's strong aversion to the Red line, his position at the U. N. grew less and less secure. Eventually the Walters committee recommended termination of his employment on expiration of his fixed-term contract, and Dr. White appealed first to a joint appeals board and then to the admin-

istrative tribunal. The tribunal found that the allegations presented by Dr. White's counsel concerning hidden political motives of some of his superior officers were unsubstantiated, and noted that he had received on dismissal an act of grace payment of 5 months' salary.

In considering the tribunal's decision, Americans might take into account the fact that when charges amounting to serious misconduct were brought against the U. N. Red 11 the Secretary General leaned over backwards to accord them due process; he consulted a special commission of jurists who recommended their dismissal. Despite this the tribunal awarded the 11 (including the holder of only a temporary-indefinite contract) reinstatement and/or indemnification and damages. But when loyal Dr. White was dismissed without a single charge of misconduct, the tribunal awarded him nothing.

Dr. White's legal counsel, a former president of the American Foreign Law Association, has stated his belief that White's termination was the result of hidden political motives on the part of some of his superiors. Counsel also wrote: "Mr. White's superiors in the United Nations Secretariat, practically without exception or limitation, affirmed the high quality and standing of his work throughout his service in the Secretariat."

The leaders of 20 outstanding nongovernmental organizations with consultative status at the United Nations sent a letter to the Honorable Byed Amjad Ali, then president of the Economic and Social Council, expressing their confidence in Dr. White's "integrity, competence and spirit of service" and also their belief that "no one in the Secretariat more than he has helped to interpret the significance of charter provisions for the recognition of nongovernmental organizations as a means of giving the voluntarily-organized public opportunity to participate in the work of the Economic and Social Council."

Thus, it seems, a review of the facts in the case of Dr. White should lead Americans to inquire: "Whose human rights does the United Nations Administration wish to protect?"

On January 1, 1954, Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld issued a new year message that concluded:

"Our work for peace must begin within the private world of each one of us. To build for man a world without fear, we must be without fear. To build a world of justice, we must be just."

Yes, indeed.

PROPOSED SALARY INCREASE IN JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE BRANCHES

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have received a letter from the Secretary of the American Bar Association, informing me of the text of a resolution adopted by the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association at its recent meeting in Atlanta, Ga. The resolution approves the salary increases in the judicial and legislative branches of the Federal Government, as recommended in the report of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries, and as incorporated in amendments which I offered for printing last January, and which I intend to propose to my bill S. 1663, now pending on the Senate Calendar, whenever that bill may be called up for consideration in the Senate.

In this connection, Mr. President, it is my understanding the majority leader

some time ago informed leaders of the bench and the bar that it was his intention to call up this proposed legislation during the first week in April. I should like to ask the able majority leader if he can tell us now when this bill will be brought before the Senate for consideration.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Nevada that the bill has not yet been scheduled by the majority policy committee for consideration. I believe the Senator will agree with me that there is some proposed legislation of higher priority which needs to be considered. However, I shall keep the Senator and the Senate advised of the developments.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not know whether I agree with the majority leader that there is any proposed legislation of higher priority, but I should like to obtain consideration for the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am glad to have the distinguished Senator's views, and will keep them in mind.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., March 31, 1954.

HON. PAT McCARRAN,
Chairman, Standing Subcommittee on
Improvements in Judicial Machinery,
United States Senate, Wash-
ington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR McCARRAN: At the recent meeting of the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association, the following resolution was adopted upon recommendation of the Standing Committee on Judicial Selection, Tenure and Compensation:

"Resolved, That the American Bar Association approves the salary increases in the judicial and legislative branches of the Federal Government, as recommended in the report of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries, dated January 15, 1954, and as incorporated in amendments to S. 1663, offered January 18, 1954, by Senator McCARRAN, of Nevada, and in H. R. 7510, introduced by Congressman CHAUNCEY W. REED, of Illinois."

This is being sent for your information and whatever action may be appropriate.

Sincerely yours,
JOSEPH D. STECHER, Secretary.

CONSTRUCTION OF HIGHWAYS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3184) to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended, and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is not the pending question the so-called Chavez amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is it correct that the yeas and nays have been ordered on the Chavez amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I do not know whether any Senators desire to speak in support of the Chavez amendment or not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] expects to speak in opposition to it.

Mr. MARTIN. I should like to make a brief statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wonder if the Senator from Arizona could not be recognized so that he may proceed at this time. He is compelled to leave the Chamber shortly.

Mr. MARTIN. Certainly.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I must confess that I have had much difficulty in making up my mind as to how to vote on the Chavez amendment. It has not been easy to decide what is the right way to do.

I have before me a memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Arizona under date of March 1, 1954, which concludes with the following resolution:

1. That the Congress of the United States retain the formula set forth under section 21 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1952, and that said present formula be applied to all similar legislation which may be enacted and all appropriations which may be authorized for Federal aid to highways, and specifically that it be applied to future interstate allocations.

It is stated in the preamble:

In order to cite a comparison which will highlight and emphasize the glaring inequity of the 1954 proposal—

The 1954 proposal referred to in the memorial is that a larger amount of money be applied to the national system of interstate highways to be apportioned according to population. That is not what the pending bill provides. The bill as reported to the Senate provides that only one-half the amount authorized for the interstate highway system shall be apportioned according to population—

attention is directed to the State of Kansas, which has 701.5 miles of interstate mileage, and improvement to the interstate system is fixed at 0.80 percent of the total allocation. Under the proposed formula, Kansas will receive a net amount of \$2,919,000. On the other hand, and in sharp contrast, is Arizona's position under the proposed population formula. As previously pointed out, this State has 1,136.9 miles of interstate highways. Arizona's estimated cost of improvement to this system is 0.82 percent of the total allocation, but it is scheduled to receive but 0.75 percent, or a net amount of \$1,838,000. Here, then is a case where one State, Arizona, has 435.4 more miles to improve, a higher improvement estimate, but more than \$1 million less than the State of Kansas with which to achieve the improvement.

The situation as stated in the memorial adopted by the Arizona Legislature has been changed by agreement of both the House and Senate Committees on Public Works that only one-half of the funds authorized for interstate roads shall be apportioned according to popu-

lation, and the other half according to the usual formula. That formula was adopted in 1916 at the suggestion of Hon. Dorsey W. Shackleford, of Missouri, chairman of the Good Roads Committee of the House of Representatives. It was by the adoption of his proposed compromise which made possible the enactment of the original Federal-Aid Road Act. It was then provided that one-third of the money appropriated by Congress for Federal aid should be apportioned according to population, one-third according to area, and one-third according to the mileage of post roads. Representative Shackleford placed that last provision in the bill because the Constitution provides that Congress shall have power to establish post roads.

I reported to the Senate the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. If I do so say myself, it has proved to be a very effective piece of legislation. In that act it was provided that—

There shall be designated within the continental United States a national system of interstate highways not exceeding 40,000 miles in total extent so located as to connect by routes, as direct as practicable, the principal metropolitan areas, cities, and industrial centers, to serve the national defense, and to connect at suitable border points with routes of continental importance in the Dominion of Canada and the Republic of Mexico.

The concept of a strategic network of national highways was first developed shortly after the First World War, when the Bureau of Public Roads inquired of the War Department whether it would be desirable to concentrate appropriations for highway construction upon routes determined to be of strategic value.

Gen. John J. Pershing was at that time Chief of Staff. The map submitted by the War Department to the Bureau of Public Roads is known as the Pershing map. It comprises approximately 56,000 miles of roads as of strategic importance.

The 1944 Highway Act provided for the designation of not more than 40,000 miles. It is my understanding that up to the present time approximately 38,000 miles have been designated as being in this category.

We did something else in the 1944 act. For the first time Congress breached the original formula of area, population, and mileage of post roads, by providing in that act for an appropriation for urban highways based solely upon population. Therefore, the formula which it has been stated has not been changed up to this time actually was substantially modified in the 1944 act.

Since 1944 Congress has appropriated money for urban highways, apportioned strictly according to population. The reason for that is simple. In order to get in and out of cities and towns with wide enough streets to carry the ever-expanding flow of traffic, frontage must be condemned. The larger the town, the higher the cost of highway frontage. We did prevent all the money going to the big cities by providing that it should be allocated to municipalities having a population of 5,000 or more, but, nevertheless, the appropriations are appor-

tioned upon population, and nothing else.

It has been represented to me by the Bureau of Public Roads that the great difficulty in constructing the strategic highway system is that the Bureau runs into bottlenecks in trying to build roads through populous centers. Therefore, it was recommended originally that the entire sum be apportioned according to population.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Is there any source the Senator knows of to which one may turn to determine where a given primary highway stops and the interstate highway commences?

Mr. CASE. If the Senator from Arizona will yield—

Mr. HAYDEN. It is obvious that the 38,000 miles which have been designated as strategic are also a part of the Federal-aid highway system. According to the findings to War Department that particular mileage would be more important to the national defense than any other mileage on the Federal-aid system.

Mr. CORDON. Is there extant any map or any source of information regarding the precise roads which have been designated as making up the 40,000 miles, or whatever the mileage is?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] probably may answer the Senator's question better than I can. I yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. CASE. The committee has arranged to have a map placed at the rear of the Chamber showing the interstate designations. Small copies of the map are available, and I shall be happy to send one to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. How many lineal miles have been so designated?

Mr. HAYDEN. Thirty-eight thousand miles, out of the forty thousand miles, which were authorized to be so designated by Congress in 1944.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe the distinguished Senator from Oregon will find his question answered if he will turn to page 269 of the hearings. At page 269 he will find a copy of the official map furnished by the Public Roads Administration covering the national system of interstate highways, now amounting to about 38,000 miles.

Mr. CORDON. Is it planned that these 38,000 miles of highways, most of which I assume have already been constructed in some form or other, are now to be reconstructed or widened, or to have lanes added to them?

Mr. HAYDEN. That need is evident on most of the main highways throughout the United States.

Mr. CORDON. Is it particularly true with respect to this strategic highway system?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. CORDON. It would be idle to call them interstate highways and do nothing on them. There must be something it is intended to do on those highways which it is not intended to do on other primary highways. What is it?

Mr. HAYDEN. According to the pending bill, \$150 million would be applied each year for 2 years to the 38,000 miles of highways. According to the House bill, \$200 million a year would be applied to the same designated 38,000 miles.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Arizona is speaking in terms of money. I am speaking of construction or reconstruction, and what is intended to be done to the so-called interstate highways, which would make them different from a primary highway in any given area. Are they to be wider, are they to have a heavier base, are they to be changed in length, or what is to be done to them?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from South Dakota so that he may give a more complete answer to the question of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CASE. With the indulgence of the Senator from Arizona, under the description that has been given to me of interstate highways, the Senator from Oregon has pretty well indicated what the situation is. In some cases it means a wider highway. In some cases it means a heavier base. For example, on the limited interstate highway with which I am familiar in my own State, it has meant putting concrete in place of tarvia, where the traffic was heavy and the highway had a particular military use. In other cases it has meant improving the alinement. In still other cases it has meant changing the grade. It has also meant straightening the highway, and it has meant moving the primary road and bypassing a town or city so that it would be possible to avoid the traffic flow in urban centers.

In a letter which I received from the Commissioner of Public Roads this morning, with relation to another question which has arisen, he pointed out the problem the Bureau has encountered in getting roads through or around cities, with the widening that is taking place and the cloverleaf designs which have to be developed, to afford access to the roads. Although a section of an interstate road may not be a limited access road, in the sense that a toll road would be, there are places where there must be controlled access to the interstate system by means of cloverleaf patterns, or something of that sort.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yielded to the Senator from South Dakota, to answer a question of the senior Senator from Oregon, because I was satisfied that he could answer the Senator's question in more detail than I could, since I am not now a member of the Public Roads Committee. However, what the Senator from South Dakota has stated confirms my understanding of the situation.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a brief statement?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. The reason I asked the question was that I have not been able to get the type of information I feel I should have, if I am to support

the position of the committee. When I find the committee submitting a report containing this kind of recommendation, since I know the personnel of the committee, the recommendation carries weight with me. However, when I turn to an independent examination, to determine why the report is as it is, I am unable to find, for myself independently, the information I desire to have. I believe it is very important that on the floor of the Senate as complete a statement be made as can be made with respect to precisely why, in the case of interstate roads, there is a need for a different yardstick of measurement in apportionments between the several States.

Mr. HAYDEN. One answer is that, as I have previously stated, back in the 1920's, the Bureau of Public Roads asked the War Department to designate a road mileage which they considered to be of high strategic value for the national defense. Approximately 56,000 miles were so designated on a map submitted by General Pershing. In 1944 the committee and the Congress adopted 40,000 of the 56,000 miles as essential for the national defense. It is now being proposed to appropriate money for that mileage. Last year, for the first time, \$25 million was specifically appropriated for that purpose. It is now proposed by the House to authorize for such strategic highways \$200 million a year and the Senate committee has recommended \$150 million a year.

What the Arizona State Legislature was complaining about in the memorial sent to me was that the money was to be apportioned entirely according to population. Both the House and the Senate committees have recommended a compromise in that respect, with one-half to be apportioned according to population and the other half according to the long-established formula.

Mr. President, when I first became a Member of Congress many years ago Champ Clark told me to remember that there never was an important piece of legislation placed upon the statute books except as a result of compromise. I have found that to be invariably true.

Under the present circumstances, I have been persuaded to make up my mind that Congress might well try out this change in the basis of apportionment for the next 2 years. After all, there is nothing permanent about any Federal-aid highway legislation. It is always a 2-year arrangement. If we find that it does not work properly, Congress can return to the old system of apportionment of Federal aid among the States.

The legislature of my State adopted another memorial on March 1, 1954, which recommends "that the Congress of the United States increase the annual amount of Federal aid for highways to \$900 million."

This memorial was based upon the understanding that the total amount of funds derived from the excise tax on gasoline by the Federal Government was approximately that sum of money. The Congress is now in process of doing what the Arizona Legislature asked to be done

in that regard. The Congress will also undoubtedly agree that only one-half of the money made available for the construction of the national system of interstate highways shall be apportioned according to population under these changed circumstances, it now seems to me that I would be justified in voting against the pending amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I particularly appreciate the way the Senator has developed this matter, as the sponsor and founder of the Federal-aid system. I am deeply grateful for his having gone into the question and having gotten to the heart of the problem. In the first place, the committee report does follow the suggestion made by the distinguished Senator, by authorizing a total appropriation of \$1 billion a year, which is the estimated amount of revenue derived from the gas tax.

The real reason for giving special recognition to interstate highways is that they are not being built. I have had the committee staff prepare a compilation, copies of which some of the Senators have, showing the average cost per mile of removing the bottlenecks in the system. In the eight great States which are customarily listed first by those who are supporting the idea of allotting all the interstate funds on a basis of population—namely, California, Illinois, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Texas—it appears that the cost per mile for the completion of the incomplete links is \$532,000, whereas, in the case of 15 other States chosen from all parts of the Nation, in which the total mileage of the interstate system is approximately equal to that in the 8 States which I mentioned, the average cost per mile is \$92,000, or approximately one-sixth of the cost of construction in all States where there is heavily congested population. So, as a result of that situation, the bottlenecks have not been eliminated.

New Jersey has the greatest problem of all, as I have been told this morning by Mr. Hale, the executive head of the American Association of State Highway Officials. On the interstate system in New Jersey, there is a road which, leaving New York, goes through cities across the river from New York, such as Newark and Jersey City and on to Philadelphia. The expense of constructing that highway as a through highway has been so great that the road authorities have not attempted it. They are using old roads, and have built, instead, partly to meet the need, a toll highway which misses some of the cities, but which does connect with Wilmington at the lower end of the State of New Jersey. Additional construction has been practically stopped because of the enormous expense involved.

Similar situations exist in New York, Massachusetts, and other States. It seemed quite clear to the committee that progress should be made toward eliminating these bottlenecks. Work along that line is critically important in this age of atomic bombs and hydrogen

bombs. The Defense Department and other agencies have made it clear that the elimination of these bottlenecks is of immense importance to the security of the Nation.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator from Florida will permit me to interrupt him, we heard that same kind of testimony before the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads when Congress adopted the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944. It was stated that a road could be built in the country areas without undue cost, but in cities and towns the cost would be increased so greatly that the project could not be undertaken. So in the 1944 law we authorized an appropriation of \$125 million a year for highways in urban areas, to be apportioned among the States upon the sole basis of population.

A showing quite similar to the one which the Senator from Florida has mentioned induced Congress to depart from the previous formula.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, did not the Senator from South Dakota, a while ago, seek to justify the interstate fund as a special fund? I am not opposing the fund as such, but the Senator from South Dakota spoke of the immense cost of constructing roads in cities. Does not the bill carry \$190 million to be used exclusively to overcome the various bottlenecks, and is not even that apportioned on a basis of population?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is entirely correct. The amount of money carried in the bill for that purpose has been increased, as the amount heretofore appropriated has not been sufficient to accomplish the desired result.

Mr. STENNIS. I point out in that connection that I have figures before me indicating that 46 percent of the funds for urban roads is to be spent under the interstate system, and the bill authorizes \$87 million—

Mr. HAYDEN. We are authorizing a much larger sum of money for all highway purposes than has ever before been authorized, and if a part of it is to be devoted to the strategic highway network, I feel we can afford to take a chance on a different apportionment for the next 2 years and see how it will work.

Mr. STENNIS. According to the present practice, 34 percent of the funds for primary funds is used on the interstate highway system. Under the pending bill it will amount to \$116 million. Forty-six percent of the funds for urban roads amounts to approximately \$87 million, making a total of approximately \$203 million. Then under the bill, \$150 million more goes to interstate highways, which will make a total of \$353 million of the \$910 million provided by the bill. According to express provision in the bill, and under present practice, that is to be spent on the interstate system. In addition to that, the bill provides that the Federal Government will put up 60 percent of the cost of the interstate highways and the States will put up only 40 percent.

Those facts, taken together, constitute one of the main reasons why I oppose

going a step further and providing a special cut when it comes to apportioning among the States. That is the very heart of this fight.

Mr. HAYDEN. I confess to the Senator from Mississippi that it was not easy for me not to make up my mind to disagree with him, but I felt we could proceed under the new formula for the next 2 years, and in that time ascertain how the plan works.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The distinguished Senator from Mississippi has referred to the fact that the distribution of the funds under the matching formula for the interstate system will be on a basis of 60-40. That, as the distinguished Senator from Arizona knows, is a departure from the previous formula.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GORE. I think it is fair to relate that in the committee I opposed the 60-40 formula. I thought it would be advisable to retain the 50-50 matching method. However, a majority of the committee favored the 60-40 method. The reason given was that the interstate system is a national system, and that the national interest is paramount. Because of this national need for an interstate system, the committee felt justified in matching funds on a 60-40 basis.

If that be true, as I believe it to be true, then would it not follow that the Senate, in giving consideration to the interstate system, should bear in mind that the national need for an interlocking strategic system of first-class interstate highways is paramount, and that, therefore, we should place the most money where the need is the greatest, rather than to proceed with the old system of allocating funds on a basis that does not give proper recognition of population.

Let us authorize the money for interstate roads on the basis of national need. If it is to be for local development, then we have the secondary highway system which I support. If it is to be half national and half State, then there is the primary system remaining on a 50-50 basis.

We are here considering the building of a system of interstate highways throughout the Nation, a comparatively new venture, on a 60-40 matching basis. Whether the cost be small or great, a system of national interstate highways is to be built to serve the entire country. I believe that is the basis upon which the question should be judged.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from Tennessee has made a very sound argument. It must always be remembered that there is an imperative need for every kind of road. The farmer needs roads to get from his farm to town. Cities need better and wider streets in order to prevent decay. The hearts of many cities are rotting because of the lack of proper transportation to enable people to get into and out of them. The demand for modern highways, as is demonstrated by the increasing number of automobiles and trucks, is tremen-

dous, and the demand has not been met, and will not be met even by this bill.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. The Senator from Arizona has discussed this proposal in connection with the original plan, or the Pershing map. I have always been very greatly interested in the highway system, because its first consideration was the needs of the Military Establishment. The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] raised the same question.

I apologize for a personal reference, but I have had a great deal of experience in the use of the interstate system for military purposes. In 1941, I think I had occasion to use a total of seven projects of that kind. In one instance, I traveled with 2,400 vehicles, carrying about 16,000 men with their equipment, for 1,600 miles. That gave me an excellent opportunity to see what had been accomplished.

Last summer, as the chairman of the committee, I traveled over the Nation to observe our roads, our waterways, and other transportation facilities. I came to the conclusion that the United States is further behind in the construction of roads, particularly the interstate system, than it is with respect to any other need confronting the country at present. That is why I started, last December, to try to sell to the administration the idea that there should be appropriated for roads this year approximately the amount of money which is collected from gasoline taxes. The bill practically covers that amount.

The House authorized an appropriation of \$200 million for the interstate system. I did not want to have the Senate go too strong on the proposal. I feel a great deal as does the distinguished Senator from Arizona. This is an experiment. I have spoken from the military standpoint; but the highway system means just as much from the civilian standpoint, if not more, because people travel by buses from one part of the Nation to another, and materials are transported by trucks from one part of the Nation to another, thus increasing the strength of our economy.

I just came from a committee meeting, at which the Secretary of the Treasury gave an outline of the proposed new tax bill, the whole purpose of which is to strengthen our economy and to provide more jobs. That is the reason why I think the bill now under consideration is very important, and I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Arizona very much.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. As I examine the record with reference to the new formula, I find that 19 States stand to gain in amounts ranging from \$2 million to \$6 million. Twenty-nine States will lose, under the new formula. Some will lose as much as \$1 million or more. Here is the information which has been laid before me.

Of the 29 States, Minnesota, according to the figures I have been able to obtain, stands to lose about \$1 million un-

der the new formula. If I am in error, then I wish to be corrected. But before I cast a vote on this question, I wish to know, first, why a new formula? What is the specific justification for adopting a new formula?

I am not a member of the committee. I have not been on the floor throughout the entire discussion of the bill; I have been here only a part of the time. But the very first question I should like to have answered is, Why is it desired to adopt a new formula?

Federal aid to State highways has served exceedingly well, and much has been accomplished in the development of the national highway system which enables a person to travel in comfort from a given place in the Nation to a distant point with a minimum of difficulty in finding his way. Therefore, I think the present system is good.

Will Senators explain to me why it is desired to improve upon our national system by adopting a new formula for the apportionment of the funds?

Mr. HAYDEN. The first information I had about a change in the formula with respect to the strategic system of highways was as a result of a complaint I received from Arizona, stating that Mr. Francis V. du Pont, Commissioner of Public Roads had, it was understood, recommended to the House Committee on Public Works that the money for all classes of Federal aid for highways be distributed 100 percent on the basis of population. I discussed that matter with Mr. du Pont, and I found that that was not his recommendation at all.

It never was the intention of Commissioner du Pont that all Federal aid should be apportioned to the States on a 100-percent population basis. Merely because of the excessive cost of constructing roads into and out of cities, he thought it was proper that the 100-percent population basis should apply to the strategic system of highways. That was his sole suggestion.

The House has provided and the Senate committee has recommended that the amount authorized for interstate roads be apportioned on the basis of population.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota a question.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am glad to yield the floor to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from South Dakota seemed to raise a question when I said that Minnesota stood to lose substantially under the new formula. Some of the figures which I have seen would indicate that the State of Minnesota stands to lose \$1,186,000. I do not say that is the exact figure. I do state, however, that I have seen figures which would indicate that would be the amount Minnesota would lose under the new formula.

When I examined the question further, I found that other States would lose under the new formula. I also discovered that 19 States would gain in allocations under the new formula, those States being California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Illinois, Indiana,

Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, and West Virginia.

For instance, according to the figures which I have been able to gather and those which have been furnished me, the State of New York would stand to gain more than \$6 million under the new formula. Before a vote is cast on the pending question, I want to be certain, first, of the justification for this type of new formula. Secondly, I wish to know why one State stands to gain under the new formula while another State is to suffer a loss.

I go back to the original statement made, that Federal aid to States in the development of our highway system has functioned quite wonderfully and that we do have an excellent system of national roads. I wish to be certain that we go forward rather than crosswise or backwards when the Senate adopts a new formula.

Mr. CASE. I shall try to answer the questions which the Senator from Minnesota has raised, which I think are very logical.

Before I answer the question as to the origin of the change, I may state that the Senator from South Dakota in the committee voted for what was substantially the Chavez amendment. I did that because I was looking at the provision particularly from the standpoint of its effect on the State of South Dakota. A majority of the committee voted the other way and I made a further study of the matter.

Mr. THYE. If I may refer to the figures I have obtained, the State of South Dakota would lose about \$1,254,000 under the amendment.

Mr. CASE. That would be on a 2-year basis.

Mr. THYE. I am now speaking about the formula provided.

Mr. CASE. If someone wanted to go into the State of South Dakota and say that he knew that FRANCIS CASE, on the floor of the Senate, advocated a change in the formula which would cost the State of South Dakota \$1,200,000 in the way of highway funds over the remainder of time to which the funds would apply, he could do so. My reaction, first of all, would be that I do not want to kill the goose that lays the golden egg. The States which are going to be affected by the change in the formula are States which now, even with the change in formula, in the main, will not get as much in highway allocations as they pay in gasoline taxes.

Discussions of the bill started with the idea that as much money would be devoted for highway purposes as was collected by the Federal Government in taxes on gasoline, diesel fuel, and lubricating oils. So it was stated on the floor of the Senate that money was being taken away from certain States. Actually, the taking away is the other way around. For instance, the State of California collects \$78 million in revenues from taxes on gasoline and lubricating oils for the Federal Government. But even with this change in formula,

California will get back only \$48 million. The State of California will collect \$30 million more in gasoline and lubricating oil taxes than she will be allocated out of highway funds.

The origin of the change in formula came from two sources. It came, first of all, through an examination of the cost of completing the interstate system. It was an examination of that cost which led the Association of State Highway Officials to adopt a resolution recommending an appropriation of \$250 million for the interstate system, which amount increased 10 times the \$25 million provided for in the present law. That resolution was adopted by the Association of State Highway Officials by an affirmative vote of 46 of the 48 States. The State of Minnesota, in its ratification of the action of the Association of State Highway Officials, not only agreed with an appropriation authorization of \$250 million, but wanted the \$250 million allocated on a population basis.

Mr. THYE. If the Senator from South Dakota will yield further, I have communications on the question. I hold in my hand a telegram from Mr. E. Ray Cory, president of the Minnesota State Automobile Association, which reads, in part, as follows:

We request your support on—

1. Maintaining \$200 million of Federal aid for the vitally important interstate system, instead of \$150 million as recommended in Senate bill.

2. Holding that interstate system funds be apportioned among States of population formula with a minimum of 1 percent to any State.

3. Denying use of Federal aid funds for cost of utility relocations until results of nationwide study of subject are known.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. That recommendation from that very reputable body, as I am sure it is, goes a great deal further than does the bill reported by the committee, in following the population basis.

Mr. THYE. I recognize that.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator yield, so that I may make another statement?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The recommendation of the Association of State Highway Officials went a great deal further in recommending \$250 million as a minimum out of the \$900 million, which was all they were asking for, than does this bill which authorizes \$1 billion. Under their recommendation \$250 million dollars would go for the interstate highway system. The association also recommended that the amount be apportioned entirely on a population basis and on a 75-25 matching basis. The association went further than the suggestion which the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has frankly read into the RECORD, and it went further than the bill, which is more or less of a compromise, which the committee reported in an effort to meet various points of view.

Mr. THYE. I have another telegram in my hand, this one from Mr. Lou Hosking, of the Minnesota Motor Transport

Association, which reads in part, referring to Senate bill 3184:

Urge you to support move on Senate floor to restore sum of \$200 million for interstate highway system and support of proposed new formula for distribution of funds. We support exclusion of provision to provide funds for relocation of utility services.

Both these organizations in the State of Minnesota have been among the foremost in efforts to improve the highway system of Minnesota, as well as of the Nation as a whole. They have been organized not only to promote the State highway system endeavors, but for general highway improvement. The State of Minnesota has an excellent system of highways.

The main thought which occurs to me is that when I look at the proposed new formula, certain States are going to suffer a loss, whereas other States stand to gain substantially because of the revision in the formula. I must make certain I shall not be voting Minnesota out of some funds to which she justly and rightfully should be entitled.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UP-
RON in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to assure the Senator from Minnesota that I not only appreciate his position, but I can understand it very fully, and I would expect him to take it.

The fact of the matter is that in the committee, I took the identical position taken by the two officials in the telegrams the Senator from Minnesota has just read.

I wanted the \$200 million figure. I felt that even under the \$150 million figure we would be paying too little attention to the bottlenecks in urban areas. I also would have been glad to go along with the House authorization of \$200 million, and to make all of it available on a population basis—which would have meant applying the population basis to 20 percent of the entire authorization.

Under this compromise bill, developed by the give and take process, only 7½ percent of the total authorization, or \$75 million in each of the 2 years covered, is to be apportioned on the population basis.

We feel that the advocates of preferred attention to the interstate network have gone a long way in trying to be practical about this matter. So I hope the distinguished Senator from Minnesota will feel that it is not necessary to ask for the restoration of the \$200 million figure, which originally was supported by me; because if he were to ask for its restoration, I would have to oppose such an effort at this time. Having given and taken in committee, in order to bring forth a fair compromise measure, I feel just as the Senator from South Dakota has indicated he feels; namely, that I should stand by the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for yielding to me.

Mr. President, the Senator from Florida says that in view of the fact that the pending bill is a compromise measure, and has been brought here as such, it should be supported. I wish to point out to the Senator from Florida and to all other Senators that no Senator is bound by what happened in the committee on a compromise vote. On the particular matter under discussion there was a difference of only one vote in the committee; and those of us there served notice then that we would reserve the right to oppose the provision when it came to the floor. So any reference to being bound by a compromise does not apply.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, what the Senator from Mississippi has said is correct; there was no binding effect, other than as certain members of the committee might feel themselves bound.

Mr. STENNIS. Furthermore, I have been told by the Senator from Florida that this provision, the new formula, affects only 7½ percent of the total authorization provided by the bill. While the Senator from Minnesota is making up his mind about the amendment, he might remember that although his State is being treated as he has pointed out, 42 percent of the increase provided by the bill as reported by the Senate committee, as compared with the authorization provided by last year's bill, will go to the interstate highways. So when we vote for the enormous increase in the authorization, making it \$1 billion, let us remember that 42 percent of it will go directly to the interstate highway system, with respect to which his State is being left out to the extent he has stated, whereas under present practices 34 percent of the primary road funds provided in the bill could be spent and would be spent on interstate highways, and 46 percent of the urban highway funds, according to present practices, would be spent on the interstate highways. So they are faring very well.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield once more to me?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Mississippi is a member of the committee, and was present at its hearings and deliberations; therefore he knows all the questions which were discussed and studied as the bill was drafted.

On the other hand, I do not serve on the committee; therefore, I pick up this question and try to acquaint myself with it. The very first thing with which I am faced is that under the new formula it is immediately proposed to take away from quite a number of States a certain portion of this Federal fund, which under the old formula would be allotted to them. Furthermore, the old formula has given the Nation a splendid and excellent highway system. So I must be certain that I am not discarding something that has served well for something that will not serve my State as well as it was served by the provisions of the old formula.

The Senator from South Dakota, a very intelligent member of the commit-

tee, will, in voting for the amendment, be voting his State out of approximately \$1,256,000, over a period of 2 years, according to the figures I have gathered. I know the Senator from South Dakota, intelligent as he is, would not vote for the amendment and would not vote to do that unless he had a good and just reason for doing it, because he will have to answer to the people of his State when they look at this particular set of figures.

For that reason, I fully understand and appreciate that there must be some good reason why the Senator from South Dakota supports the committee version of the bill, even though it will cost his State approximately \$600,000 a year.

If the Senator from South Dakota can convince me that all of us should support the bill under the new formula, I wish to do so, because the president of our State association, Mr. Goring, and also Mr. Lou Hosking, who heads the largest trucking association in our State, and is one of the ablest businessmen in Minnesota, seem to recommend to me that I support the committee version of the bill. I do not wish to be in error and I do not wish to disappoint those men; but I also have the State of Minnesota as a whole, including all the highway system which exists in Minnesota, to take into consideration; and I do not wish to be a party to legislation which may take care of one specific train of thought at the expense of the network of highways in my State.

If the Senator from South Dakota can convince me that the committee version of the bill will result in the doing of the proper thing, I will support that version. If not, I will support the amendment now before the Senate.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I certainly respect the conscientious way in which the Senator from Minnesota attacks this problem, as well as other problems which come before the Senate.

Let me say that whatever way the Senate votes on this amendment will be the position I shall take in conference. I believe in trying to carry forward the ideas which I feel I may have any responsibility for carrying forward. I do not know that I shall be one of the conferees; but assuming that I may be, I will try to carry out the will of the Senate as evidenced by its vote.

A quick answer to what the Senator from Minnesota has said and to what I have said about South Dakota is that, first of all, South Dakota's Federal gasoline tax and lubricating-oil Federal excise-tax collections amounted to \$3,682,000 in 1952. Under the apportionment clause of the committee version of the bill, South Dakota will receive \$11,252,000, even under the new formula.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota read into the RECORD the figures for Minnesota?

Mr. CASE. Yes. For 1952 the Federal Government tax on gasoline and the Federal Government excise tax on lubricating oil in Minnesota amounted to \$16,827,000. The State of Minnesota will receive from the allocations provided by the committee version of the bill, under the formula reported by the committee, \$21,514,000. The State of Minnesota will

thus receive more than \$5 million more than she collects in gasoline taxes and lubricating-oil excise taxes for the Federal Government.

Mr. THYE. However, Minnesota pays more in proportion than does South Dakota, in terms of what is received.

Mr. CASE. Yes; but that is not because of the new formula. That situation would be more adverse under the old formula.

Mr. THYE. Let us consider the situation in Florida, one of the States which stands to gain. I do not single out Florida for any particular purpose, for I have the greatest respect in the world for the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. Florida is one State which stands to gain. So long as we are considering the amount allocated, let us compare that figure.

Mr. CASE. In 1953 Florida collected for the Federal Government in excise taxes on gasoline and lubricating oils \$18,921,000. Under the apportionment recommended in the bill, it will receive \$15,052,000. It still will not receive as much as it collected.

Mr. THYE. Let us take the State of New York. That is one State which stands to gain quite substantially. In fact, under the new formula, that State will gain the most.

Mr. CASE. New York State collected \$57,068,000. It will receive \$57,954,000.

Mr. THYE. Can the Senator tell me why that one State should have a better ratio than the other States? It would be receiving back all it contributes.

Mr. CASE. The two amounts are almost the same so far as New York is concerned. But take New Jersey, immediately next to it. New Jersey collected \$29,191,000, yet will receive back, even under the new apportionment, only \$17,320,000.

Mr. THYE. Going back to New York, which, under the new formula, will have allocated to it as much as it collects, why should New York have as much allocated to it under the new formula as it collects, except on the pro rata basis?

Mr. CASE. What happens to New York under this formula is really incidental to the total picture. If we consider all the States which will gain, it will be found that practically all of them are not now getting as much, even under the new apportionment, as they collect from gas taxes. But that is not the primary reason why the American Association of Highway Officials endorsed this proposal. Representatives of the association came before the committee and said that they recommended \$250 million for interstate highways, and that 46 of the 48 States, through their representatives in the American Association of Highway Officials, endorsed the authorization of the amount.

The Senator from South Dakota is a little provincial in his thinking about highway funds. I did not like to jump up the interstate system from \$25 million to \$250 million, and leave the secondary roads where they were. I was too provincial to accept the bill which was recommended by the administration, or the House bill, in that respect. Under the

bill recommended by the administration, the secondary road funds would have been increased only from \$165 million to \$180 million. Funds for the primary system would have been increased only from \$247,500,000 to \$270 million, whereas funds for the interstate system would have been increased under the administration proposal from \$25 million to \$200 million.

So in our deliberations in the committee I sought to win support for the bill which I had introduced, which would have provided a large increase in primary, secondary, and urban road funds. Those are the old categories. I proposed to increase the interstate system only from \$25 million to \$35 million, an increase of \$10 million, or 40 percent, about the same increase as was proposed for the other categories.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I am sure the Senator will agree with me that the States are faced with a very severe problem in trying to build up the roads to meet the traffic needs. Our towns are also faced with problems. A revolutionary change is taking place in local communities. The little schoolhouse is being closed. Consolidated schools require school buses, making necessary an improved highway system in the township of school district to accommodate the school buses. That means a terrific expense upon the township and upon the county, because of the roads which the county must take over in order that the system of highways in the county may be improved.

Taking into consideration all the State problems in connection with roads, I am led to examine the bill with exceeding care to make certain that we do not appropriate huge sums of Federal funds and then, by legislative action, deny a State the right to a proportionate share of such funds to meet its problems, while giving to certain other States a greater proportionate share. Those States may be in a much better financial condition to meet their problems than are some of the States with respect to which it is proposed to decrease the sum of money to be allocated to them. I am trying to get a complete answer so that I may vote intelligently.

Mr. CASE. I appreciate the searching way in which the Senator from Minnesota is going into the subject, because it helps to bring out the facts which I think the Senate should have. For the very reasons which the Senator has suggested—the consolidation of schools, the need for better roads from farm to market, and so forth—I was unwilling to accept the proposal to make a great increase in interstate road funds, practically none for the secondary system, and none for the normal primary system.

Mr. THYE. I commend the Senator.

Mr. CASE. I resisted as best I could the proposal to authorize \$250 million for the interstate system, and make practically no increase in funds for the secondary system. I resisted the authorization of \$200 million, which the House

provided, and which the administration suggested. I suggested in committee that if we were to increase the secondary road funds, we should go up to not more than \$100 million for interstate roads, and place the bulk of the increase in the primary and secondary road funds. We discussed the question thoroughly, and finally arrived at an amount of \$150 million for interstate roads. By holding the amount to \$150 million, we could place the remainder of the increase in the primary and secondary road funds. The amount in the present law for secondary roads is \$165 million. The House proposes to go only to \$180 million, or an increase of \$15 million.

In the bill before us we propose to go to \$228 million. We went \$48 million above the House proposal in connection with secondary roads. In the case of the normal primary system, we went \$72 million above the House figure.

So, having persuaded the committee to accept larger increases in connection with primary and secondary roads, when a majority of the committee approved \$150 million for interstate roads, although I voted against it and voted for the lower figure, having served as chairman of the subcommittee conducting the hearings, I felt that when the bill came to the floor I should have another look at it. I have gone back through the hearings and studied them, with the result that there has been a little shock to my own thinking. I find that the cost of building the interstate system is much greater in some States than I had expected. I had thought that, in connection with that part of the interstate system in my section of the country, the portion around the northern edge of the Black Hills might be somewhat more expensive. I felt that I knew something about the terrain in California and in other States. When I came to examine the mileage, in comparison with the costs, as shown in the table on page 66 of the hearings, I came to the conclusion that if we were to complete the interstate system at approximately the same date throughout the country, we must do something different in connection with the formula. On page 66 I think there is most convincing evidence as to why a change in the formula was needed with respect to the interstate system. I invite the Senator's attention to the table on page 60 of the hearings.

He will find, for example, that my State of South Dakota has four-tenths of 1 percent of the cost of completing the designated portion of the interstate system, yet under the old formula it would receive 1.61 percent of the dollars—in other words, 4 times its share of the cost.

Mr. THYE. The State of South Dakota is not a small State. Can the Senator explain to me why the cost is so much lower in the State of South Dakota than in other States? Why is there a greater cost in other States?

Mr. CASE. I should say primarily because construction over the prairie area is much cheaper than it is in States which have a high congestion of traffic,

or States such as Pennsylvania, in which there is a great deal of mountainous or rough terrain.

Mr. THYE. We realize that in the construction of a modern highway across the countryside, where values are high and where farmsteads are numerous, it is often necessary, if it is a part of the national network, to relocate buildings or to acquire city property, which is highly expensive, in order to widen streets, and so forth. I assume that is why the Senator is endeavoring to allocate more money to certain States where the density of not only the farms but of city property also, involves a tremendous expense in obtaining rights-of-way. Is that correct?

Mr. CASE. That is definitely a part of it. We are concerned also with the flow of traffic and wider highways and highways of heavier base.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, may I ask one more question of the Senator?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Does the bill permit a State to draw on Federal funds in order to prepare plans and to obtain information relative to the proper location of the highways? In other words, some of the States are faced with the question of where to obtain funds with which to make plans. I wish to make certain that it is clearly stated in the RECORD how a State could acquire such funds. In other words, I have a question before me, asked by the Minnesota commissioner of highways, Mr. M. J. Hoffmann. I will read the question to the Senator:

Is there a provision in the Highway Act whereby States could utilize Federal money for designating and planning important highway projects, to be later deducted by the Bureau of Public Roads from the total amount paid on final reimbursement after completion of the project?

Does the bill provide for such an advance to States for planning purposes in the preparation of a highway project?

Mr. CASE. The pending bill does not specifically provide for it. However, in my judgment, a former act does so provide. I may say to the Senator from Minnesota that a gentleman who is connected with the highway department of the State of Minnesota, Mr. C. D. Johnston, whom I knew many years ago—in fact, I went to college with him—called me and asked me the same question Mr. Hoffmann presented to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I am acquainted with Mr. Johnston.

Mr. CASE. I find that section 2 of the act of July 19, 1939, amended section 10 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1938, as follows:

SEC. 10. With the approval of the Federal Works Administrator—

This was written at the time the Bureau of Public Roads was under the Federal Works Administration, and, of course, the Commissioner of Roads has inherited the title and authority of the Administrator—

not to exceed 1½ percent of the amount apportioned for any year to any State under the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, except sections 3 and 23 thereof, shall hereafter be used with or with-

out State funds for surveys, plans, engineering, and economic investigations of projects for future construction in such State, either on the Federal-aid highway system and extensions thereof or on secondary or feeder roads or grade-crossing eliminations.

Therefore, in my opinion, if a State found it did not have sufficient funds with which to take care of its matching funds and also to do some advance planning, money could be obtained in an amount up to 1½ percent of the amount of the apportionment.

I assume that amount would be charged against the allocation to the State when the final settlement was made on the project.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from South Dakota referred to page 66 of the hearings a few moments ago. I should like to inquire as to who prepared the table, and how much authority there is behind it. I have seen a table showing how much it would cost to construct highways in my own State and how much it would cost to construct highways in other States.

I have in mind that it is stated it would cost from \$50,000 to \$60,000 a mile in my State, and \$2 million a mile in another State. Of course, if we ran a main highway through the center of the city of Washington, making it necessary to tear down a great many buildings, I could understand that the cost of construction would be \$2 million a mile. However, that is not the way to construct a highway that would be of the greatest use.

I should like to inquire who prepared the figures and how much validity is behind them.

Mr. CASE. The clerk of the committee advises me that the table was supplied to the committee by the American Association of Highway Officials, on which each State has representation. It was presented to the committee in connection with the testimony of Mr. Alfred E. Johnson, president of the association.

I may say to the Senator from New Mexico that I, too, wondered about the costs. I believe some of them would have to be revised in the light of possible modifications of the system. I had a letter this morning from Mr. Francis V. du Pont, Commissioner, Bureau of Public Roads, in which he stated that the remaining mileage within the interstate limitation of 40,000 miles is to be used for keeping some of the roads outside the cities, instead of having them go through the cities, and he hopes it may be possible to do so. That may reduce the cost incident to constructing roads through cities.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have seen tabulations showing the per-mile cost of highways in the various States of the Union. Those figures do not even remotely resemble the figures introduced the other day. I wondered where the figures were obtained, because it seems impossible that the cost in one State

could be 70 times the cost in another State.

A bag of cement costs about the same everywhere in the United States, giving a few pennies one way or the other. Gravel is available all over the United States. Mixing machines work at about the same capacity. Labor costs on the highways do not vary very much. How can the committee justify figures which show the cost of construction per mile as even 52 times greater in one State than in another?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield so that I may point out something to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. CASE. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from South Dakota referred to the table at page 66 of the hearings, as did the Senator from New Mexico. In the column "Cost of work needed" there appears the footnote figure 1. The footnote at the bottom of the page reads: "Thousands, based on estimates by individual States, not adjusted to current price levels."

Apparently the figures were not given careful scrutiny and were not adjusted to the current price levels. That fact sheds considerable light on the point on which the Senator from New Mexico has put his finger.

Mr. CASE. Except that it should be a compensating error in the several States, if the figures were not adjusted to the current prices.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from South Dakota referred to the enormous cost of construction in the congested areas. In referring to the cost of the highways of the interstate system in congested areas, we must bear in mind that it also costs money to build highways in the rural areas. However, going back to the table on page 66, New Mexico, for illustration is shown as having 2.72 percent of the miles of the national system of interstate highways.

Skipping over to the next to the last column, the apportionment to New Mexico under section 21, which is the Chavez amendment, would be 1.69 percent of the money. On a population basis, under the Senate bill as it now reads, New Mexico would get only 0.75 percent of the funds. That shows the other side of the picture.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator also point out that New Mexico's share of the cost is 0.52, approximately half of 1 percent, and if it receives 1.69 percent of the money that is about three times its percentage of the total cost.

Mr. ANDERSON. I could not possibly more greatly commend the Senator from South Dakota. I realize that both the Senator from Minnesota and I, by a strange coincidence, were born in the State of South Dakota, and we realize that miles spread out there as rapidly as they do in Minnesota or in any other State. I drove through many States in returning to the Senate last fall. Are these figures based on the actual cost of constructing a mile of road, or is there another factor included which is not apparent?

Mr. CASE. So far as I know, I can only rely on the estimate furnished by

the State highway officials of the States. This table was furnished by the Association of State Highway Officials.

Mr. ANDERSON. Was the State highway representative from my State asked how much it would cost to finish the interstate road system in that State, or was he asked how many miles there are, and how much it would cost per mile in each State? He might say that one good road in New Mexico going east and west and one going north and south would be all that the State would need.

Mr. CASE. The map showing the situation appears in the hearings at page 269, and there is also a map in the rear of the Chamber.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The further question raised by the Senator from New Mexico troubled me, so that I went not only to the staff of the committee but also to Mr. Hale, who is head of the American Association of State Highway Officials. We found that the first column on page 66 shows the accurate mileage for each State of the total of the national system of interstate highways which has been allocated. Congress fixed it at not to exceed 40,000 miles, and there have been designated between 37,000 and 38,000 miles of that system. So that the figure, I have been advised, for each of the States is the accurate actual mileage of the interstate highway system found in each State.

With reference to the cost of the work involved, I am told by Mr. Hale and by the witness who presented the testimony, who is the head of the Highway Department of Arkansas and is strongly supporting this measure, that the cost of the work was carefully estimated by each State and reconciled in the Bureau of Public Roads office here, and that appears in the third column as the cost of work needed to complete the system. There is a difference between those two columns. Much of the mileage has already been completed in some States, and in other States, where there is mileage either passing through or surrounding large industrial areas and cities, there has been practically nothing done on the highway system since it was designated. The total figure of \$11,266,372,000, is the total of the estimates coming to the national headquarters and reconciled and compiled here as being the cost of the work needed to complete the system.

I repeat, that in some States a large part of the mileage has been completed, and in other States the opposite is true.

The other figures are carefully and accurately shown as to the population percentage, and are completely accurate, based on the 1950 census. The apportionment under section 21 which would be received by each State is based on section 21 as it applies to the primary system, and the apportionment on the population basis, if it were all made on the population basis, is shown in the final column.

The only thing which could cause trouble in interpreting this particular compilation is that when we come to the

estimate by each State as to the cost per mile the only way available to us to compute that cost is on the full mileage of the interstate system in each State, because we do not have the final figures as to how much mileage has been completed in each State. That accounts for some of the differences which the Senator from New Mexico has mentioned.

The one figure which particularly bothered me was the figure opposite the State of New Jersey. I am sure that is the one which has bothered the Senator from New Mexico, because it shows that with a mileage of 192.4 miles the estimate for the completion of the project is \$404,053,000, or more than \$2 million a mile. I addressed Mr. Hale particularly as to that item. He said, "The trouble is that the cost is so great for the branches of the highway system in New Jersey that they have not done anything on it." He said they use the old road going to Jersey City, Newark, and through various other cities to Philadelphia, which is the branch of the interstate system in New Jersey. The only other highway now existing is a toll road which does not reach the city of Philadelphia, but goes on down to Wilmington, Del. The cost has been simply prohibitive.

The figure in the table is the best estimate of what it will cost to acquire the rights-of-way and to build that very badly needed road which throughout almost all its mileage traverses heavily congested industrial and urban areas.

Mr. ANDERSON. Can we have the figures showing what the New Jersey Turnpike cost per mile?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not have those figures. The New Jersey Turnpike was located, I remind the Senator, on areas away from industrial developments.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is what the Senator from Minnesota was talking about. That is where such a highway should be located.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words in connection with the interstate highway fund.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield so that I may make an additional statement?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not understand the parliamentary situation. The Senator from Florida and I were discussing the situation in New Jersey.

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I call the attention of the Senator from New Mexico to the fact that on page 221 of the hearings the New Jersey Turnpike is shown to have cost \$285 million for a distance of 118 miles. This indicates that the cost was at the rate of \$2.4 million per mile, if my quick calculation is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I merely wish to point out that the contemplated 192-mile project in New Jersey would cost \$404 million, which is certainly at a rate which is the equivalent of the cost of the

New Jersey Turnpike. That indicates that apparently none of this road has been built by the State of New Jersey.

But the State of South Dakota has done a great deal of work by stretching the road from Sioux Falls to Rapid City, and South Dakota received very little money.

So by locating highways where they should be located, a State gets no money; but if a State refuses to build highways where they ought to be located, it gets a lot of money.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield briefly to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Unfortunately, the New Jersey Turnpike does not render the services to the highly industrialized parts of New Jersey which are required to be served by the interstate system.

Mr. ANDERSON. I grant that. I merely say that South Dakota has one road stretching across the entire State. That happens to be, I am quite certain, Highway 30, because I once lived along that highway. That road is pretty well finished. Therefore, South Dakota will not get much money, since it built its road where it should have been built, according to the interstate plan. But because New Jersey will build a turnpike in another direction, it will receive \$400 million with which to build it. I do not see why the funds should be apportioned in that fashion.

Mr. HOLLAND. For fear the Senator from New Mexico may not correctly understand the situation, none of this amount would go to the building of the turnpike. None of this amount would have any relation to the turnpike.

Mr. ANDERSON. I understand that. I am only saying that because New Jersey built a toll road, it will, under the new interstate highway system plan, now be able to build an entire new project, which the Senator has correctly pointed out has not yet been built.

Mr. HOLLAND. It does not serve the important military objectives required to be served by the interstate system, which would be served, as to the congested area from New York City to Philadelphia, by constructing it as part of the New Jersey mileage in the interstate highway system.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. If the philosophy of the suggestion made by the Senator from New Mexico should be carried to the extreme, would it not defeat the very purpose of having a free system of interstate highways in the United States?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. I am certain the Senator from New Mexico did not mean to suggest that he preferred to have toll highways, which do not serve the needs of the interstate highway system, rather than free highways, which do serve the needs of the interstate highway system.

Mr. ANDERSON. Not at all. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] had addressed some questions to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. I was very much interested in the replies. I thought the Senator from South

Dakota had made a very fine presentation, but he did not answer the question in my mind as to the reason for the difference in cost.

I say the cost in New Jersey, where there are very highly industrialized areas, if the type of highway desired is to be built, probably would have to run to \$2 million a mile, because the New Jersey Turnpike cost \$2 million a mile. On the other hand, to construct a road across South Dakota would cost less, because the road would stretch across fairly open country. I know that to be so, because I once lived in that part of the country.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator would refer to the list of comparative costs under the plan of aid to States which have suffered most heavily, but which have done the least in opening the bottlenecks, he will find, for instance, that the State of New York shows a much simpler picture than does the State of New Jersey, and a much less expensive picture per mile, \$830,000 a mile, according to the method of which I advised the Senator awhile ago. I took that up, also, with the statistical experts, and I was told that the difference between New Jersey and New York is that, while there are very heavy needs in New York, in and around New York City and other large cities, there are long stretches of rural mileage involved, mileage between small towns in New York, so that the situation in New York is not comparable to that in New Jersey, with its limited mileage. They find no fault with the comparative estimates of cost because of the difference between the 2 States and the 2 highway systems.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words about the apportionment of funds for the interstate highway system. I do so because I think the sums mentioned, for instance, \$150 million in the Senate bill, and \$200 million in the House bill, are not sufficient to put the interstate highways in a condition which is adequate to the needs of a great Nation such as ours. The bill I submitted to the Senate proposed a \$900 million authorization for this system. I believe that amount is essential, in order that we may build this system to an adequate, safe level. I realize also that compromises have to be made, but we must not forget that the highway system of America is a very vital part of our national defense.

I shall say a few words about the particular amendment which is pending. I think it ought to be defeated. I am glad it was possible to defer its consideration until today, when we have a longer time to discuss it. I wish to thank the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and other Senators, for discussing the matter in detail today, because I think it involves an issue which should be clarified. In order that it might be discussed today I did something that I do not believe I have ever done before, namely, gave a live pair to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

The interstate system is a national highway system; it is not merely a State system, as some would indicate. I think

the question raised by this amendment is much broader than whether my State would lose a small amount or gain a small amount. I do not think we can look at the picture and say that if my State would lose a certain number of dollars, I should not be for the amendment; or that if it gained a certain amount of dollars I should be for it. As I think one Senator indicated, he felt he could figure out exactly how the vote would go. He would list the States which would lose money under the committee proposal. They would be for the amendment. If a State would gain money, that State would be against the amendment.

Michigan pays 4½ percent of the Federal gasoline tax collected. If S. 3184 were passed, Michigan would get 3.59 percent of the interstate road funds. According to the same schedule, our needs on the interstate system are 3.7 percent. So even though we received more money, we would not get all that we had paid in gasoline taxes.

But be that as it may, I wish to point out that what is proposed is an interstate system of highways. It is a national system of highways, not a State system. Anyone who come to the national capital, be he a Senator or a Representative, except if he lives in one of the States immediately contiguous to the District of Columbia, will travel on some of these highways. I might cite an example. When I travel from Detroit to Washington, I travel on 165 miles of toll road through Pennsylvania. That distance can be covered in 3 or 4 hours. The total distance from Washington to Detroit is 550 miles. From 10 to 12 hours are spent on the rest of the trip, so it is necessary to consider the proposed highways as national highways.

I wish to compliment the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] for the great work he has done on the bill. I think personally this is the greatest highway bill ever to be considered by Congress. But I shall say some things about it. I am disappointed, even though it is a fine bill. Some may say that the Senator from Michigan speaks in this way because automobiles are made in his State. I speak in behalf of the interests of my State, but I speak also for the entire Nation, because I do not know of a four corners in the United States which does not have some concern about highways, and which does not have a concern about automobiles.

A 10-percent excise tax is imposed on automobiles. It was imposed in the early days of the war, because it was said, it was not desired to have people buy large numbers of automobiles at a time when it was necessary to make war materiel and munitions. Therefore it was said, "Let us put a tax on luxuries that people can do without."

Today I do not believe the people of America consider that an automobile, whether a pleasure car or a truck, is a luxury. Even if a man is out of a job, an automobile is a necessity, because he has to use an automobile even to look for a job. Car owners pay more than \$2,208,000,000 a year in taxes on automobiles and highway uses; and up until the bill

under consideration was proposed, only about half of the gas tax was ever devoted to the building of highways. The previous bills provided for about \$550 million to be used for highways. The gas tax alone will produce \$900 million in revenue.

One out of every seven employees in the United States is directly or indirectly connected with the automobile industry; so the automobile is a necessity. I can name many parts for automobiles which are made in States other than Michigan; so that the bill is of interest not only to Michigan, but it has a nationwide application, so far as automobiles are concerned.

The time has come when we ought to think about excise taxes levied on particular products such as automobiles, trucks, or parts, which are worn out because of defective roads, taxes which are now used for the general support of the United States. I think the time has come when a great amount of such tax money—I believe all of it—should go into the construction of highways, which are essential to our civilian life, to the very life of the Nation as a whole, and to the defense of America. Therefore, as I said, the interstate system is a national system. While the bill is only a halfway measure, a compromise, yet it is a step in the right direction.

Why do I say that population should have a greater consideration in the allocation of interstate road funds in the bill? Because population indicates automobile ownership. We have come to know that population has a close relationship to the number of registered automobiles. Therefore, I personally would rather have seen the allocation of funds based on the registration of automobiles, because highways are used for automobiles. However, I think the next best way is to use population as a base, because it indicates the number of automobiles and the amount of traffic.

Congress is concerned with the national highway problem and with the inadequacy of the national interstate highway system. We can solve a national problem only by taking a national viewpoint. We cannot circumscribe our horizon any longer by State lines; we have to have a larger horizon. The time has come when driving an automobile encompasses much more than driving home. Therefore, the national viewpoint must be considered, rather than a State or local viewpoint. The highway problem needs to be solved in places where it exists, and the problem is most acute in places where the number of cars and people is the greatest.

The American Association of Highway Officials have recognized the situation with respect to the interstate system as being most serious. This organization of State highway officials from 46 States came to the conclusion that apportioning highway funds on a 100 percent population basis was the best way to arrive at a correct solution of the problem. It is easy to see why. That factor represents the number of automobiles. Roads are used for automobiles; they are no longer used for the oxcart.

The association to which I just referred surveyed the entire interstate system, and it determined that 51½ percent of the total cost of bringing the interstate system up to the requirements of the national defense and commercial needs of the Nation would be used in 8 States, the most heavily populated States, and that the cost for the other 40 States would be only 48½ percent of the total. If there is to be constructed an adequate highway system, it must be done on that basis.

As I have indicated, the committee has struck a compromise with respect to this section. The House has already approved a similar method of apportioning the interstate funds. It is a start in the right direction.

What was the compromise? It was that one-half of the funds for interstate roads should be apportioned on the basis of the old formula and the other half on the basis of population. As I said, I do not always like compromises, but I think the committee did well; it got started on the right road and in the right direction. I think the entire amount should be apportioned on a population basis. However, half a solution is better than none, and I am interested in solving the highway problem on a national basis. I shall support the committee compromise, because I recognize that in view of the serious problems which the members of the committee faced, they arrived at an equitable conclusion, under all the circumstances.

Mr. President, I also wish to make a few remarks on the entire bill. The Federal-aid bill now before the Senate is a disappointment to me, as I have indicated, even though I believe it is the best bill on this subject the Congress has ever had before it. As Members of the Senate are aware, I introduced Senate bill 3069, which provides for more than twice the mileage of roads provided by the pending bill.

For a few minutes, I wish to discuss this subject from the beginning, since it is one of the most important and fundamental problems in the Nation today. I feel compelled to call attention to a domestic problem which is likely to be lost in our concern for matters of hydrogen warfare, or the right kind of foreign-trade policy. I would be less than frank or true to my duty as a United States Senator if I did not rise to discuss this issue today.

We might now call this the hydrogen age instead of the atomic age. There is nothing more important to America today, Mr. President, than highways, because the time has come to change our whole idea of civilian defense in view of what was disclosed by the hydrogen bomb test in the Pacific.

The country is now faced with the question of how we are going to preserve and maintain our great cities. America's way of life requires that we protect and preserve our great cities, and even increase them in size and facilities. One of the essential needs is an adequate highway system.

For many years I have advocated and fought for economy in the operations of the Federal Government. I sponsored,

and now have the pleasure of serving on, the Hoover Commission, which is designed to eliminate waste and duplication in the administration of the Government. "As an executive commission, we even have the privilege of recommending the elimination of programs presently performed. But I have never willfully or knowingly suggested or intimated that the Federal Government should not assume full responsibility for those programs which everyone acknowledges it must develop. For a number of decades one of the most important of our programs, if not the most important, has been Federal aid for highway construction.

Anyone who examines the Constitution and reads the provision referring to post roads must be reminded that at that time there was a different idea concerning highways. Delivery of mail over post roads was one thing, compared now to the tremendous use of highways throughout the country. Furthermore, we have the great question of national defense, which was an entirely different matter in the days of the musket and the cannon.

Federal aid for highway construction can truthfully be said to be ingrained in our Federal system of government. Constitutional recognition of this fact is evidenced by the inclusion by the Founding Fathers, themselves, of a provision for the establishment of post roads. The post-road idea originated early in our history, and therefore the Federal Government has been in the highway business for a long time.

Mr. President, I am still a firm believer in economy. The American people, through their taxes and through other expenditures, pay for all the things that make up our national standard of living. By investing more on highways, Congress can save the taxpayers money. Adequate highways are a matter of economy, as I shall prove.

Mr. President, I believe that investments in highways are capital investments and produce wealth and an improved standard of living, and therefore are not dead appropriations or a use of funds without a return.

American highways are admittedly inadequate. It is a matter of plain hard fact that large portions of our present road system are unsafe; in fact, critically so, and are wholly inadequate to meet the needs. The highway accidents, deaths, and injuries indicate that beyond any doubt.

The construction of adequate highways is admitted by all to be very expensive. I am told that 6-lane expressways can cost up to 10 millions of dollars a mile. Even a minor 2-lane highway, properly constructed, can cost today more than \$100,000 a mile.

Acknowledging the evident inadequacy of our system, and recognizing the large expense involved in bringing the system up to date, to meet our country's needs, the question may well be asked—"Is it worth it to broaden the base of highway construction at this moment?"

I say it is. Today we are faced by a condition, not a theory. The true statesman does not deceive himself.

Mr. President, the former head of the Bureau of Public Roads recognized that there is such a matter as false economy. Let me quote Thomas H. MacDonald, the former Commissioner of Public Roads, who gives emphasis to my point in his statement that—

We pay for good roads whether we have them or not—and we pay less if we have them than if we do not.

What this means to me is that we ought to construct the roads we need, when we need them. If we do not, we shall pay for them, anyway, in terms of lives lost, unnecessary accidents, and higher costs of operating passenger cars and commercial vehicles.

I am told that a completely adequate interstate highway system would save the highway users \$2.2 billion yearly—the approximate amount which my bill, S. 3069, would provide for highway construction for 1956 and 1957. In other words, we might as well invest this money in improved highways, because the cost to us will be that much, anyway.

Let us ask ourselves again the question, "Is it worth it to broaden the base of highway construction?"

I shall not belabor the obvious national-defense aspects of our highway system. Let me only say I completely agree with our great President who recognized the tremendous significance of highways when he said:

Next to the manufacture of the most modern implements of war as a guaranty of peace through strength, a network of modern roads is as necessary to defense as it is to our national economy and personal safety.

Another phase of national security is protection of our citizens in the event of enemy aggression. The evacuation of our people from points of attack will depend almost entirely upon public roads. It is obvious that the present roads in the United States will not and cannot meet our civil-defense needs.

Is it worth it to build more roads now? I certainly think it is. I feel the American people know it is.

We can solve our Nation's highway problem. It is within our power to do so, if we wish. But we cannot do it with half measures; and in the light of my own conscience, I cannot but regard the measure before us as a half measure.

Mr. President, some persons say we should be building toll roads. I do not think toll roads demonstrate anything other than that even though the people pay more than \$2,200,000,000 annually in taxes on automobiles, automobile parts, and gasoline—taxes which many persons think are being used by the Federal Government for highways—the people are paying even more for the use of toll roads, in order to get better roads. To my mind, that is a clear demonstration of the fact that we have not been adequately providing for highways; and I believe it is time that we applied the taxes on gasoline and automobile parts to the building of highways.

Mr. President, I believe I have demonstrated that our highway system is inadequate. It is obvious that the solution to the problem will be costly. There is no question, however, that it will be

worthwhile to solve it. After all, the simple fact remains that we are paying for it, either way.

We can solve it with an approach such as the one I have advocated Senate bill 3069. If we do not provide a solution now, we shall have to do so in the near future, and at a greater ultimate cost.

Mr. President, Americans are accustomed by nature and tradition to think and act big. We have achieved our eminence in world affairs by doing things bigger and better than other people have done them in the past. There is absolutely no reason why we cannot follow our natural inclinations in providing ourselves with the finest highway system in the world.

Unfortunately, we do not have it now. That is the reason for my disappointment about the measure we are now considering, even though it is considered the best highway bill we have had to date.

Mr. KERR rose.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma does not wish to speak at this time, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma wishes to say a few words. He would not wish to interfere with the quorum call.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, there was some discussion yesterday with reference to a proposed amendment relating to a study to be made in connection with payment of the cost of relocating utilities, made necessary by highway construction. The question arose as to whether the study should be made by the Commissioner of Public Roads or by the Secretary of Commerce. I should like to inquire of the Senator from South Dakota whether he has agreed to accept such an amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, in response to the question of the Senator from Tennessee, let me say that I have no personal objection to the proposed amendment. I have talked with the chairman of the committee, and he has no objection. In a great deal of highway legislation, the two officers are used interchangeably. However, in view of the fact that there seems to be a little feeling that the study might better serve the purposes for which it is intended if the Secretary of Commerce were designated to make the study, I see no objection to the suggested amendment. If the Senator from Tennessee desires to offer it, so far as I am concerned, it will be agreeable to me.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator. While we all have confidence in the Commissioner of Public Roads, the proposed study involves other economic factors and conditions which enter into the survey. It seems to me that it should be on a broader basis, and that the study should be made by the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I shall be glad to withhold the suggestion of the absence of a quorum, if the Senator from Oklahoma wishes the floor at the present time.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment sponsored by

the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and myself.

I listened to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. I was intrigued, impressed, and interested by many of the things he said. I thought it was a very salutary situation that the Senator from Michigan had found a matter with reference to which he could agree with our President.

I agree with anyone who advances the statement that this country has not been and is not now building roads as fast as conditions warrant, and the necessities, health, and welfare of our people require.

I have long favored an accelerated roadbuilding program for the construction of free roads by the Federal, State, and local governments. I think there are provisions in the pending bill which would help to accelerate the building of such roads. However, that does not justify a change in the basic policy of the National Government and the formula for allocation of road money which has been followed for almost half a century.

States of larger area and greater road mileage have just as much of a necessity for more and better roads as do neighboring States with greater population. I have no case to make against a State with greater population. That element has always been recognized in the formula under which Federal road funds have been allocated. But, I ask, What is there now, in 1954, in the element of population alone, which should compel the Federal Government to change its formula of allocation?

I thank the Senator from Michigan for being frank enough to say that this is the opening wedge. I thank the Senator for making it plain to Members of the Senate that this is the opening wedge in the drive by those whose interests are determined by population alone to bring about a condition whereby all Federal funds for road building will be allocated on the basis of population. I say to those of my colleagues who, perhaps, had thought that this was merely a little item, a special item, that the Senator from Michigan has made it plain that this is not the end of the aims and objectives of those to whom I have referred, but the beginning.

It has been said on the floor of the Senate that the formula applies to only 7½ percent of the billion dollars authorized by the road bill. As I interpret the bill, it applies to 15 percent. It applies to the allocation for the interstate system, which is \$150 million. That is approximately 15 percent of the amount authorized by the bill.

The so-called interstate system is not something that came into being with the writing of the bill. The interstate system has been there all the time. The so-called interstate system is now and has been a primary system of roads.

Someone in Washington looked at a map of the United States showing the highways constituting the primary system, and took a ruler or a pencil or a stick and said, "We are going to give

portions of these primary roads a new name, a new designation. We will create a new segment of the national highway system and call it the interstate system."

It is not a new system at all. I say that the Highway Department of the State of Oklahoma did not so designate it. I am aware of the fact that a part of the interstate system is in Oklahoma. I am aware of the fact that a part of it is in every other State, perhaps. However, the State highway departments, the governors, and the legislatures of the States did not say what part of the primary system of roads would be known as the interstate system and receive special consideration.

The only case that has been or can be made for a separate allocation is on the basis of national necessity. I do not believe that the representatives of the States in the Senate can overlook this fact with respect to the bill, namely, that whatever we do to meet a national need and a national necessity is a responsibility of the National Government, and should not be permitted to be used as an instrumentality to penalize the States of the Nation. The sole justification for the designation of this interstate highway system is on the basis of national defense. The designation, so I am advised, was made by the Defense Department and the Federal Bureau of Roads.

To whatever extent the historic formula for the distribution of allocated funds is changed because of national-defense necessities is and must be regarded as a responsibility of the National Government.

Under the cloak of national defense and national necessity, the State of Oklahoma should not be penalized in a manner that results in the great State of Michigan or any other State getting a portion of the road money to which the State of Oklahoma is entitled. That is what is involved in the bill.

If the interstate highway system is justified and demanded and required for national defense, it ought to be built by the Federal Government, and the formula governing Federal contributions to roadbuilding should not be changed under the guise of acting on the necessity of national defense, when the sole result is to penalize the many for the benefit of the few. That is what the formula does.

I say to Senators that if this entering wedge is permitted to go into the bill, next year, as was indicated in the speech by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], or 2 years from now, when the next road bill comes to the Senate, an effort will be made to have the entire amount for primary roads allocated on the basis of population.

As I looked at the map, I found that there are thousands of miles of primary roads in this country which are not included in the so-called designated interstate highway system, but which are just as vital for national-defense purposes in time of war as are those which are included in that system.

I challenge the proponents of the bill as written by the committee, and those who oppose the pending amendment, to

tell the Senate when the so-called interstate highway system was designated.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I do.

Mr. HOLLAND. I hold in my hand quite a lengthy and scholarly report on interregional highways, transmitted to Congress in a message from the President of the United States, then Franklin D. Roosevelt, in 1944, as we neared the end of the war. In it he recites the record of the development of the interstate system, and sets forth that on April 14, 1941, looking to defense needs, and also to the economic needs and the transportation needs, he had appointed a National Interregional Highway Committee, and that that committee, as the war was coming to an end, had made its report. He made certain observations with reference to it, and then he transmitted it to Congress.

The substance of it was that during the war a strategic network of roads had been set up by the military authorities, consisting of about 79,000 miles; that on going over it the military felt that about half of that mileage was more important than the other half, and that substantially half of the so-called strategic network was recommended to be set up in the interstate system.

That committee made a study of it at the time. If the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma had been in the Chamber earlier today he would have heard the able senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who participated in the setting up of the interstate system, recite the fact that the interstate system was the result of long study within his committee after the preparation of the report of the Interregional Committee of the President of the United States and after transmittal to the Congress of the message of the President of the United States. The road bill of 1944 established the interstate highway system along the lines recommended by that committee. The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma will find a very comprehensive report and many maps in this compilation, and he will find quite a number of other publications coming from the committees of the House and Senate at that time.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I have yielded to the Senator from Florida, and I want to reply to him.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have tried to show that the interstate road system did not simply grow up like Topsy, but that it was the result of a long and difficult study and of the application of wartime experience.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Florida. He has brought forth the information as I have understood it to be. I have not read the compilation to which he has referred, but I am sure that if it is as comprehensive as the distinguished Senator has indicated it is, it will show that such a system has been in the minds of planners for many years.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. In a moment.

I have seen maps of strategic highways, now interstate highways, which date back to the 1930's, and during all that time, Mr. President, men have sought by one device or another to change the historic formula of the allocation of funds to the several States. In view of the statement of the distinguished Senator from Florida, who in his remarks carried us back in history to at least 1941, 13 years ago, I wish Senators would explain on the floor what there is in 1954, Mr. President, that warrants the drastic action recommended by the Public Works Committee of the Senate to change the historic formula of allocation of funds for roadbuilding purposes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. One of the things that has happened in 1954 has been the development of atomic power and the hydrogen bomb.

Mr. KERR. Atomic power was developed some years ago, and a hydrogen bomb was exploded last year.

Mr. HOLLAND. This is the first time the committee has had a chance to study this subject since the explosion of the hydrogen bomb.

Mr. KERR. The committee has explored the situation.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is likewise the first time the committee has had a chance to explore this question since the recommendation, which was almost unanimous, of the American Association of State Highway Officials came to the Congress and to the committee. That recommendation, approved by 46 of the 48 States, in accordance with the statement in the record by the witness who gave us the facts, strongly points out that the completion of the interstate system is not only most vital to all States, but also that its completion is being stymied by the lack of funds in important areas where the costs are prohibitive.

It also points out the fact that by 46 out of the 48 States participating it was recommended that not less than \$250 million of a suggested total appropriation of \$900 million for Federal aid to roads be dedicated to the interstate system, and that the money be apportioned wholly on a population basis and also on a basis of 75 percent Federal aid and 25 percent matching contribution by the States.

That had much to do with the consideration of the question by both the Senate and House committees.

The Senator will, no doubt, recall that the President of the United States, in his message on the budget, called attention to the imperative necessity of the completion of the interstate system. The Senator will also recall that when the Secretary of Commerce, by his assistant, appeared before our committee, he testified that not less than \$200 million should be appropriated upon the basis provided by the House bill, which is a much more generous basis than that provided by the Senate bill. That was the recommendation at that time, and is now, so far as I know, the recommendation of the administration.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the greater the national necessity, the greater the

justification for the work on the interstate system being done by the Federal Government, and the less basis there is for the States to be penalized in order to accomplish it.

The distinguished Senator from Florida says that something was recommended by 46 out of the 48 State highway commissions. They are not charged with that responsibility in my State. This is the first time I have seen the great and distinguished and able Senator from Florida leaning on the recommendation of an anonymous highway group as a justification for his own acts and those of the Senate. He says this is the first time the matter was considered by the committee. I have been on the committee for 5 years, and the effort has been made every time a road bill has been before the committee to get in an entering wedge to change the formula of allocation. This is the first time a majority of the members of the committee have been from the more populous States. That is the historic "first" about the deal, Mr. President.

I cast no reflection upon the distinguished members of the committee. I know of no committee composed of more able members. But they happen to represent States which will benefit by a change in the formula. That is the reason why the bill is on the floor containing the language which appears in it. That is the reason why it came from the House in that manner. But that does not mean that Senators from the 29 States which will be penalized are either bound by what 7 men from the more populous States thought and did, or are thereby absolved from their responsibility to their separate States.

I do not presume to answer for another State, Mr. President, but, so far as the State of Oklahoma is concerned, my people did not send the highway department here to represent them. They sent two Senators here to represent them. When I arrived here, there had been in existence for more than a quarter of a century, and, I think, for a third of a century, a formula for the distribution of Federal funds for roadbuilding purposes. I should be derelict in my responsibility to my State, Mr. President, if I did not do all within my power to remind my colleagues that the question before the Senate today is whether the historic formula which benefits the great majority of the States and does justice to all is to be changed and an entering wedge driven by a small number of States on the basis of taking from the minority of States for the benefit of the majority of States.

The interstate highway system is all right, Mr. President, but I remind Senators that it is still a part of the primary system, and I remind them, further, that every mile of it is within the boundaries of some sovereign State. It is not built in the air nor out yonder somewhere. Every mile of it goes through a sovereign State. I did not draw the map of the interstate highway system. No one representing the State of Oklahoma drew it or designed it or selected it. I think, Mr. President, it would be a tragedy if someone could do that and thereby create an instru-

mentality or a vehicle whereby violence would be done, not only to the historic formula of distribution, but also to justice as between the States.

Mr. President, under the bill the Federal Government would provide 60 percent of the cost of roads on the interstate system, so-called, and the States would contribute only 40 percent. The bill would make available a vast amount. If a greater sum is needed, Congress should provide it. If the necessity for national defense is so compelling, the Federal Government should pay the cost of national defense. Otherwise, there is nothing about the interstate highway system which either sets it apart, or permits it to be set apart and accorded special treatment, resulting in discrimination against a majority of the States.

I have seen the map of the so-called interstate highway system. I have as good eyes as anyone I know of my age. I wish to say, Mr. President, that I could take a pencil and designate twice as many highways and call them interstate highways; or, with just as equitable a result, I could mark off half of the number of highways shown, and then designate the remainder as the interstate highway system.

This proposal will not add a single highway mile to the highway system of the United States; it simply designates a part of the present primary system for preferential treatment, and is used as an entering wedge. I thank the Senator from Michigan for his frankness and sincerity in saying that he thinks all this money ought to be apportioned on a population basis. He says this is a start in the right direction.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Of course, I was speaking of the pending amendment, and also of the interstate highway system. I said that the committee has struck a compromise, one-half based on the old formula, and one-half based on population. I went on to say that I thought that was a good thing, so far as it went; that in the case of these particular roads, I felt that it was an opening, so that population would be considered as the criterion in authorizing funds for this kind of highway, because population is related to the number of cars in use.

Mr. KERR. Certainly the Senator from Michigan said it was a good thing, so far as it went. He went on to say that possibly the allocation ought to be on the basis of the automobile population, did he not?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, I did.

Mr. KERR. It is apparent to any Member of the Senate, who wants to know what the deal is, that this is an instrumentality or a vehicle of representatives of the more populous States to take from the other States a part of the road money which they would receive under the historic formula for allocation, and to increase the amount to be allocated to a minority of the States.

I do not blame the distinguished Senator from Michigan. If I were from Michigan and wanted to be reelected, I would be doing exactly what the Senator

from Michigan is doing. But I would not expect anybody to be misled by it.

I must say, Mr. President, that I should be astounded if Senators from States which would suffer by the amendment would be induced, or seduced, into voting, as representatives of their States, in the manner in which I would expect them to vote if they were from a more populous State.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I was wondering if the Senator from Oklahoma would permit himself to be the instrument through which I might address a question to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. KERR. I would rather be the vehicle than the instrumentality, but I shall be delighted to listen while the Senator from South Dakota asks the question.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Would the Senator from Michigan state whether or not, when he was referring to the use of the population formula, he had in mind any application of it to the Federal primary system or the Federal secondary system?

Mr. FERGUSON. I did not have that in mind, although the bill I introduced indicated that I felt that would be the best way. But today I was speaking of the interstate highway fund. That is the way I feel about the interstate highway funds. I think the amounts should be apportioned on the basis of population.

The Senator from South Dakota went half way, which I think is proper. As I have indicated, I shall vote against the pending amendment, although I wanted to have a full discussion last night, and I agreed to a pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for his vehicular help.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for pinpointing the attitude of the Senator from Michigan. I wish to say that if the Senator from South Dakota will probe the thoughts of the Senator from Michigan to their uttermost limits, he will not find them deviating from the track which benefits the State of Michigan the most. I congratulate the Senator from Michigan on his views. But I must say, Mr. President, that I do not think the Senator from South Dakota is bound by them. I know the Senator from Oklahoma is not bound by them.

Why should the Senators from 29 States which have been penalized by the provision in the bill written by a majority of the committee, representing the more populous States, be compelled to vote in any manner other than that which does justice to all the States, and follows the time-honored, historical, traditional formula for the allocation of road funds?

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. As the Senator from Oklahoma is a member of the committee, he must recall that the population

allocation provision of the bill was not written in our committee. This recommendation came to us from the American Association of Highway Officials, which very strongly endorses the philosophy in the bill which recognizes the population factor in connection with interstate highways. Also, in the bill which came to the Senate from the House, \$50 million more was appropriated for interstate highways, and on a formula recognizing the greater importance of population in connection with the interstate roads.

The Senator from Oklahoma seems to convey the impression that this philosophy has been written into the bill by Senators from the more populous States. I venture to remind the Senator that that has not been the case at all. We on the committee have really taken the philosophy which has been handed us by the experts, and also, I might say, by the administration and the Bureau of Public Roads. This idea did not originate in our committee.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Connecticut for his contribution to the discussion and to the fortification of the arguments being made by the Senator from Oklahoma. I did not accuse the members of the committee which reported the measure to the Senate of having no originality whatsoever. I merely said they followed a pattern dictated by the interests of the States which they represented. I only said they followed the pattern of the bill as passed by the House.

I wish to say to the great Senator from Connecticut that he is beginning what I hope will be a long and distinguished career. But if he lets the Highway Association of the United States tell him how to vote, I must say that he will not be doing justice to his own great intellect and ability.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for his advice and also for his very kind compliment.

Mr. KERR. Yes, sir. If it was considered to be in the form of advice, I will withdraw it. I intended it only as an observation, as a courtesy, and as a compliment.

I will say to the Senate that this was not the only formula or the only language considered by the committee. The distinguished committee had every opportunity in the world to use some originality and to write its own language. They had every opportunity in the world to follow the historical pattern, because they were reminded of it. It was read to them. I do not think they drafted the bill in this way simply because the Association of Highway Departments, or contractors, or engineers, recommended it. I simply think they used that as an argument to follow up and fortify the position which they took, which I do them the credit of recognizing was dictated by the interests of their States. But I remind the Senate that their action is not binding on the Senate of the United States. It is not binding on the Senator from Oklahoma, and I shall continue to oppose the proposed new formula as unjust and discriminatory language in the bill reported by the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In listening to the colloquy between the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from Florida, I believe I heard some comment which described the nature of the interstate highway system. Is the Senator from Minnesota properly informed that the interstate highway program which is contemplated under the bill is mainly a primary highway program?

Mr. KERR. No, but every mile is included in what has been known as the primary highway system.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, the interstate system is included in what is now known as the primary highway system?

Mr. KERR. The primary system includes every mile of what is now being called the interstate system.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So that one system really complements the other. Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. KERR. One system includes the other.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it the view of the Senator from Oklahoma that an integrated highway system is of great importance to our national security and national defense?

Mr. KERR. Certainly, and the whole primary system, which constitutes 6 or 7 times as many miles as are included in the interstate highway system, is of nearly as much importance as this limited part of the system called the interstate highway system, if not of equal importance.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is aware of the fact, is he not, that the RECORD of yesterday and the day before indicate that one of the reasons why the proposed formula was suggested, which formula benefits the more populous States in terms of the Federal grants, was that the more densely populated States have greater costs to bear in the construction of highways?

Mr. KERR. No; it was because the more densely populated States had a majority of the members on the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I say, such an argument was made, was it not?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The force of that argument is that the thinly populated States, by whatever legal measures might be necessary to obtain land for the purpose of road construction, would have less costs to bear.

Mr. KERR. I think that is a reasonable deduction.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That was the argument that was made, was it not?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not likewise true that the more densely populated States have greater sources of revenue than sparsely populated States?

Mr. KERR. Yes; and fewer miles of road to construct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, in the Far West, the Middle West, and in some areas of the Southwest, or practically all parts of the Southwest, the area to be covered in terms of construction is much greater, it is not, than that which would be necessary in most of the thickly populated States which would be given the benefits under the proposal?

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator referring to the area to be served by the roads?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have received communications from some of our colleagues. I have in my hands a communication signed by the two Senators from Utah [Mr. WATKINS and Mr. BENNETT]. I also have another communication signed by our distinguished colleague, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

I notice in the communication from the two Senators from Utah that according to an analysis of the differences between apportionment of interstate highway funds to the States under the new population formula of S. 2859, as contrasted with the amount that would be received by them if the entire total authorizations for fiscal 1956 and 1957 were apportioned under the existing Federal-aid formula, 29 States would lose substantial sums of Federal moneys. Is that the understanding of the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. KERR. Yes, it is; and that was the evidence which was presented before the committee. That is evidence with reference to which there is no controversy. That is evidence which, for all purposes I know of, must be accepted as fact.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I notice that the State of Oklahoma would lose approximately \$1,186,000. I may say that the State of Minnesota would also lose \$1,186,000, under this formula, according to the analysis of the two Senators to whom I have referred.

Mr. KERR. I think the Senator is eminently correct. That is for a 2-year period. Such figures are based on an allocation of \$150 million, which the House bill increased and which some members of the Senate committee wanted to increase, and the new formula applies to only half of the sum authorized for the interstate system.

I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that I appreciate his alertness and his vigilance in the Senate. Not only would the States of Oklahoma and Minnesota lose, by the passage of the bill, approximately \$1,200,000, but, as stated by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the entering wedge would be driven in the right direction. The Senator from Michigan stated that the bill was good so far as it went, but he did not think it went far enough. I venture to say that if one were to cross-examine and probe the minds of the other Senators favoring the bill, they also would say it does not go far enough. If they get this bill through, this will not be nearly so far as they will go the next time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is the Senator aware of the fact that there is a con-

certed move to take the Federal gas tax and allocate it to the States on the basis of the amount of the collections from the States? In other words, the move is to do away with the Federal gas tax and let such States as New Jersey, Pennsylvania, New York, and Michigan get their gas tax back and keep it, and not let such taxes be taken into the general revenue funds to be used for the general purposes of the Government. Is not the purpose of the pending bill a part of the same pattern? Is it not part of the pattern, in other words, really to disregard the national interest and to place the emphasis on the basis of provincial, parochial, or State interest, without regard to serving the great national program of highways?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Minnesota is eminently correct, and this is put part and parcel of the ancient principle that "they that have a great deal shall get the rest, and they that ain't got so much, shall lose what they have."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is not that the same principle as the saying "He who has, gets; and he who gets, gets more?"

Mr. KERR. The Senator is correct; and I am delighted to have heard the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota, and I am glad that he is fighting for justice and the welfare of the State of Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I commend the Senator from Oklahoma for joining the issue. I have not had an opportunity to go over all the matters pertaining to the bill, but I did look at the RECORD for the last 2 days, and I have seen the report of the committee. I have discovered very little to show that the traditional formula which has been in effect has become unworkable. It seems to me that it has worked quite well. My feeling is that this country needs a great public highway program, and a much broader and expanded highway program, but I do not think it is necessary to tinker with the formula. What we really need is money to be applied to roads. If we get the money, we can build the roads; but if we get the money and then tinker with the formula, certain areas are going to be foreclosed greatly in their capacity to build highways.

I think we have got to ask some questions. If we are going to have a great national highway system, we must think about how great roads will be constructed through the States of the Far West and the Rocky Mountain area, where costs are terrific, and also in the midwestern area, where land costs are high because of the fertility of the soil and the price of the land.

We have to think not only in terms of the number of roads in California, Pennsylvania, Michigan, New York, or other Eastern States, but also how cars are going to travel across the country. People who live in the States I have mentioned do business across the country. An integrated highway system is just as important in the interior of America as at the terminal points. Obviously, the formula which has been concocted discriminates against 29 States, and if Hawaii and Alaska should be admitted as States, it would discriminate

against 31 of the 50 States. Perhaps we should examine it. I intend to examine it very, very carefully.

Let me say at this point that I have not read or seen or heard anything to indicate to me that the new formula pertaining to the interstate highway system is anything more than what the Senator from Oklahoma has said of it, namely, a formula arrived at because the heavily populated States have on the committee more members than do the less heavily populated States; the old formula was changed simply on the basis that a majority of the members of the committee had the voting strength to do it. I do not think such procedure adds anything to the merit or strength of the Nation's overall highway program; in fact, I think it weakens the program.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, again I wish to say that I have the highest respect for every Member of the committee. The Members of the committee are intelligent; they are great Americans; and they are fine representatives of their States. But, after all, they are representatives of their States, and the other Senators are representatives of their States. Although we may have for the members of the committee all the respect, esteem, and affection to which they are entitled, and which generosity on our part would provide, I am sure we need not be persuaded to go beyond the point that the interest of our own States indicates as being a fair one.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. A while ago reference was made to the fact that the bill came to us from the House of Representatives. Let me say this is the first billion-dollar highway bill ever presented to the Senate, as the Senator from Oklahoma realizes.

Let me ask whether he also realizes that of the increase provided in this bill, as compared with the authorizations under last year's bill—the increase being not quite \$400 million—42 percent will go into the interstate system, to be matched by the States, not on a 50-50 basis with the Federal Government, but on a 40-60 basis with the Federal Government, the States to provide 40 percent and the Federal Government to provide 60 percent.

Furthermore, let me point out that under the House version of the bill 88 percent of the increase voted by the House would go to the interstate highway system. All that adds to the meaning of the attempt to change the formula, which is the third step; after receiving these enormous increases and after receiving a betterment in respect to the matching basis of the Federal and State contributions, the third step is the one which goes too far, as the Senator sees it, and calls for a new formula, by which large amounts of the money would be transferred from the States which need it most.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Mississippi is eminently correct, Mr. President, and I thank him for his contribution.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from Oklahoma recall seeing in the bill any provision that takes into consideration the tremendous amount of federally-owned land in many sections of the country?

Mr. KERR. The bill contains allowances which take some note of the situation to which the Senator from Minnesota refers, and does so on the basis of making considerable increases, as compared with the authorizations of former years.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from Oklahoma believe that the allocations and allotments which would be made for federally owned land, and which under the bill, as it is reported, represent increases over the allotments under the previous formula, would be adequate to cover the present cost of highway construction in many areas of the West and Southwest where the highways have to be constructed across desert lands, mountains, and other very difficult terrain?

Mr. KERR. On the basis of the bill as reported by the committee—and certainly this is true, aside from the amount of increase for the interstate highway system—I would say the roads the Senator from Minnesota has in mind will receive an increase which will be proportionate to the increases provided in the bill for the other roads.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So, insofar as federally owned lands are concerned—and, of course, a consideration of that problem involves, basically, the West and the Southwest—is it correct to say that the committee gave appropriate consideration to and made appropriate adjustment for those lands, by means of the new formula, so as to compensate the States concerned?

Mr. KERR. I would say that proportionate provision is made in the bill.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me at this point?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I think it is a fair statement that in the bill the Western States receive better treatment than they have received in any other road bill presented to the Congress. In this bill the amounts for the Western States are larger, and the bill also retains the provision for allowing credit for the land owned by the Federal Government.

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to have that point clarified, because I think it has a great deal to do with the so-called matching formula. In other words, we must take into consideration the areas to be covered and also the tax base and the per capita income and the volume of production. All those factors affect the ability of the States to finance their share of a highway-construction program.

Although my State is rather productive and rather prosperous, and although we have been able to do a fairly good job with our highway program, I

do not think any of us should be thinking only in terms of the highway system of his own State. On the contrary, each one of us should be thinking in terms of an interstate system covering many States.

It seems to me that a factor based on the volume of traffic and the size of population is not a valid one for consideration in connection with this matter, because a large amount of traffic, large numbers of automobile registrations, and a large population are *prima facie* evidence of a large tax base and a large per capita income. Mr. President, anyone who thinks that the determining factors proper for consideration in connection with the formula to be used are those based on a large volume of traffic, large numbers of automobile registrations, and a large population should examine the record, for the fact is that the States which rate the highest on the basis of those factors are, generally speaking, States which are comparatively small in area, whereas the States which have very large areas, and consequently which must construct very many miles of roads, are the States with smaller populations, smaller numbers of automobile registrations, and smaller volumes of traffic.

It is true that the sparsely populated States are long on ideas. However, all of us realize that roads are constructed, not on ideas, but by means of plans and money.

So the question is, Where are we to obtain the money with which to build a good interstate highway system? My interest in that question is my reason for bringing out these points.

Insofar as I can see, at least at this stage—and I suppose the debate on this measure will continue for some time—it appears to me that the new formula provided for in the bill as reported by the Senate committee will cause my State to lose approximately \$1,200,000. Certainly I credit the committee with endeavoring to do a conscientious job. However, at a time when our State needs more roads, and in view of my realization that the national interstate road system is most important to all the States and all the people, I cannot be very happy about a new formula which will cause my State to lose approximately \$1,200,000—just so that it can be said the formula is new. I do not need that much of a New Look, Mr. President. Under the circumstances, I prefer to get along with the old one.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, in conclusion, I wish to say that the great concentration of population is on the eastern seaboard, in the north-central part of the Nation, on the west coast, and in limited areas on the southern coast.

An adequate interstate highway system must connect those areas; it is just as necessary for that system to be built across Oklahoma, connecting the East and the West and the North and the South, as it is for it to be built on the eastern coast, after one gets there; and on the West coast, after one gets there; and in Michigan, after one gets there; and along the southernmost border, after one gets there.

Yet the bill would penalize the connecting areas where the greater mileage is, and where the service is equal to that rendered in the other areas; and the provisions of the bill amount to a premium or a bonus to the areas less entitled to it on the basis of equity and justice.

Mr. President, one can travel all over Connecticut—a delightful and marvelous State, in which I have traveled; but in order to travel on and make use of an interstate highway, one must leave Connecticut. To reach California, one must cross the midlands. Travelers from California must cross the midlands to get to Connecticut. That is what makes the highway system an interstate system. The midland section is just as vital as the section in the area of the termini of these great interstate roads. Yet it is proposed that States with the smallest area, contributing the smallest amount to the interstate highway system so far as area is concerned, shall receive the greatest allotments and that States which must provide the longer stretches of road, available in all four directions, shall be penalized, and receive a lesser amount of money from the Federal Treasury to build what is recognized as a national defense project. The proposal is based upon the principle of States which receive the least paying the most.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

PROVISION FOR ORDERLY USE, IMPROVEMENT, AND DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL FORESTS AND OTHER LANDS—MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion to reconsider the vote by which Senate bill 2548 previously passed the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his request for a moment?

Mr. WELKER. Certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator have reference to the conservation and reforestation bill?

Mr. WELKER. It is a bill to facilitate the administration of the national forests and other lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture; to provide for the orderly use, improvement, and development thereof; and for other purposes. The bill passed the Senate on March 8, and my motion was entered on March 9.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator be kind enough to withhold his request for a moment, until I can confer with him?

Mr. WELKER. Very well, provided I do not lose the floor. I have been waiting for 2 hours.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not wish to be discourteous or unmindful of the Senator's request, but I must have the opportunity to talk with the Senator before I agree to the unanimous-consent request. Perhaps at a later hour we can

persuade whatever Senator has the floor to yield for a moment.

Mr. WELKER. In order that we may have an opportunity to confer, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President—

Mr. WELKER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thought the Senator had concluded.

Mr. WELKER. I should like to make a brief observation.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WELKER. Has my unanimous-consent request to be permitted to withdraw my motion to reconsider the vote by which Senate bill 2548 was passed been acted upon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not.

Mr. WELKER. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion to reconsider the vote by which Senate bill 2548 passed the Senate on March 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Idaho? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, the reason why I made the motion to reconsider the vote by which Senate bill 2548 was passed, is that when the bill came before this body I was in the hospital and unable to be present.

The committee print shows that I made vigorous objection to the scope of the provision relating to court appeals, and to other provisions of the bill. I have reluctantly asked for the withdrawal of my motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed because I feel that I had a fundamental and good proposal to be considered by this body.

For example, I thought I was doing something for the vast livestock industry which uses the forest reserves of the United States Government. Briefly, my amendment would have provided for an appeal to a court of law if a permittee or user of the forest land had been arbitrarily, capriciously, or unlawfully subjected to a reduction in allotment. Some of the forest land has been used by permittees for hundreds of years. In other words, Mr. President, my amendment went to the point that I argued before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which I am a member. For example, if the Presiding Officer were operating 500 head of cattle on a certain forest reserve, and a regional forester or an administrator of the Forest Service came to him and said, "You will cut down your herd by 50 percent," the Presiding Officer could appeal to the chief of the Forest Service. I have never heard of any Forest Service chief over-

ruling anyone in his organization. Mr. President, if you were denied the right of appeal you would have the right of appeal to the Secretary of Agriculture. It was stated in the debate in the committee by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], former Secretary of Agriculture, that in his opinion, he was the only Secretary of Agriculture who ever even listened to an appeal, let alone overruled one.

That is the basis on which I urged the adoption of my amendment. I was too late in arguing it. Some people were led to believe that the conclusion of the committee was unanimous, but that is not so.

Going back again to my point, if the administrator cut the Presiding Officer's allotment, say, of 500 head of cattle, to 250 head of cattle, he would have to accept that administrative decision, whether the administrator was a Democrat or a Republican. That I do not like.

There are other provisions in the bill which I do not like. Mr. President, the bill would grant you the right of appeal with respect to other matters, but not with reference to a situation in which, if I were a forest ranger or supervisor or Chief of the Forest Service, or the Secretary of Agriculture, I could force you to dispense with one-half of your livestock, on which you have had an allotment from the Forest Service for many years. That means, Mr. President, that you would be ruined, and you would have to take your cattle to market and sell it for whatever you could get for it. It is utterly wrong.

I believe in a government of laws, not a government of men. I believe that any person who is deprived of any property right, such as the permissive use of national forest lands, year after year, is entitled to protect that right.

Let us keep in mind that my amendment went only to the capricious and arbitrary abuse of discretion on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture or the Chief of the Forest Service.

Let us consider a man who has 500 head of sheep or 50 head of cattle. It would mean in the case I have indicated, that in order to get relief—which he would never get, of course—he would have to come from Idaho, Wyoming, or Oregon, to Washington. A decision made by the administration in Washington would be absolutely final.

In my proposed amendment, for which I argued earnestly, I even went to the extent of making the permittee, the little livestock operator, put up a bond to insure that he would not appeal to the courts unless he was justified in so doing, and in the event he did appeal and was not justified in making the appeal he would be assessed the damages the Government had sustained.

I am sorry I did not have the opportunity to present the matter to the full Senate. I realize I do not have the votes or the horsepower to get the amendment through the Senate. However, I assure the Senate that next year I shall be here with the same amendment, and I hope the Senate will pay more attention to it than the committee did.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, with reference to the unanimous consent request to withdraw the motion to reconsider, to which I have no objection, I should like to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a statement which I have prepared on S. 2548.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY
PROTECTING THE PUBLIC'S INTEREST

Legislation for which President Eisenhower asked approval of the Congress in his state of the Union message "to improve the conservation and management of publicly owned grazing lands in national forests" is now overwhelmingly opposed by major conservation groups of the country.

I have written members of the House Agriculture Committee as follows:

"Under an attractive facade of what appeared to be constructive purpose, I am afraid the Senate has acted contrary to the country's best interests in approving in rather routine fashion S. 2548. I am convinced the measure was not adequately studied or understood, and as a result was not opposed in the Senate in the belief that it would serve rather than weaken conservation efforts.

"Subsequent to the Senate's approval, action of conservation groups indicates my fears about this measure were justified. Twenty of the leading conservation groups in our country are now on record as opposed to this bill as being contrary to, rather than in support of, sound conservation policy."

The conservation groups opposing S. 2548 are the North American Wildlife Foundation, the Wildlife Management Institute, Sport Fishing Institute, Soil Conservation Society of America, Audubon Society of D. C., Sierra Club, International Wildlife Protection, Nature Conservancy, Friends of the Land, Independent Timber Farmers of America, the Wildlife Society, National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, Outdoor Writers Association of America, American Planning and Civic Association, National Parks Association, American Nature Association, Izaak Walton League of America, International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners, the Wilderness Society, and the Forest Conservation Society of America. In my letter to the House committee I further stated:

"It appears rather significant to me that a measure proposed as carrying out the conservation aims of the President's message to the Congress is opposed by such a formidable group as now say this is a bad bill.

"I believe the House should listen to the advice of such respected conservation leaders as Dr. Hugh H. Bennett, Dr. Harold J. Coolidge, C. R. Gutermuth, George Heidrick, Dr. R. W. Eschmeyer, George B. Fell, Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, Howard Zahniser, Jonathan Forman, William Voight, Jr., Harry E. Radcliffe, Michael Hudoba, David Brower, Fred M. Packard, Miss Harlean James, and Mrs. Gifford Pinchot—and kill this administration proposal which hides behind the name of conservation while undermining sound conservation policy."

This bill would make it more difficult in the long run to maintain forest range use as a privilege rather than as a private right. The House should act to protect the conservation traditions best serving the interest of the American people.

CONSTRUCTION OF HIGHWAYS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3184) to amend and sup-

plement the Federal Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended, and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, as far back as I can remember I favored the development of a great road system, both under Federal auspices and under State auspices. There is nothing of greater value to the country and to its people than an easy, safe, and economical means of transportation. Throughout the years I have been in public office I have continuously favored the development of our road system.

Frankly, I was shocked when I heard the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]—and I am sorry he is not in the Chamber at the present time—state that the attitude of the Senators who are opposed to the Chavez amendment was based on purely selfish grounds. He stated that defeat of the amendment and the adoption of the proposed formula would mean discrimination against 29 States.

I say to you, Mr. President, that the formula which has been adhered to for a great many years has meant the penalization of many States, including my own State of New York, and that penalization is more drastic today than it has ever been. I believe that Senators who support the Chavez amendment, which would continue the old formula and give no effect whatever to the population factor in a State, have disregarded the fact that the populous States are under expenses in the development of their highway systems which are not paralleled in many, if any, of the sparsely populated States.

I speak only for New York—but I dare say I could speak also for New Jersey and Ohio and Rhode Island and other heavily populated States, although I do not assume to speak for them—when I say that we have expenses which are entirely unknown and not required in States of smaller population. We in the highly and densely populated States have areas which naturally and inevitably require far greater expenses in the building of roads than is the case in other States. We have expenses not only in connection with the ingress to and egress from our cities, but also greater costs in connection with the acquiring of rights-of-way and in the condemnation of property, which are inherent in the construction of any highway system.

The number of people from other States who use the roads in New York and in California is as great, in my opinion, as the number of people who live in the States of smaller population. It is not possible to get to New York or to California without passing through States such as Illinois, Michigan, New Jersey, Ohio, or Pennsylvania. They are all so-called highly populated States. According to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, they are desirous of putting something over on the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, there is a great difference, also, between the character of roads which have to be built in States such as New York or New Jersey and

those which are built in less populated States, such as Mississippi, Wyoming, South Dakota, Utah, Idaho, and other States. There is no standard of road building under the Federal act. Of course, plans for building roads have to be approved by the highway commissioners. Whereas States with small populations can build two-lane roads, or, at the most, three-lane roads, we in New York and New Jersey have to build roads of great width, divided roads, entailing very great expense.

Mr. President, when I first became an official of the State of New York, in 1928, and later became its governor, we were able to build what we thought were fine roads for less than \$100,000 a mile. Today the same roads, if reconstructed, would cost from a million dollars to two million dollars a mile, not because the quality would be better, but because we do not dare any longer to build two- and three-lane roads. We have to build great highways to take care of the density of traffic.

So, Mr. President, New York and New Jersey, by reason of their vastly greater problems, by reason of the greater density of traffic which requires far more expensive roads, and because of the cost of condemning and acquiring rights-of-way and other properties, are under an expense which States of smaller population do not have to incur.

Reference has been made to the fact that New York is a wealthy State. Of course, it is a wealthy State. But let it not be forgotten that New York pays into the Treasury of the United States—and the Treasury of the United States belongs to Wyoming, Tennessee, Mississippi, Idaho, and other States as much as it belongs to New York—far more than does any other State in the Union, to the extent of approximately 15 percent of all the revenues collected. Those revenues come from income taxes, corporation taxes, excise taxes, gasoline taxes, and all the other taxes which make up our fiscal structure. New York not only pays into the Treasury of the United States by far the greatest amount of money paid by any other State, but the per capita payment of the people of New York is greater than that of any other State in the Union. I think we are fortunate to be able to do that. I certainly do not begrudge the payment of taxes. I am happy that New York has a sufficiently large population and has safeguarded its employment, its workers, and its businessmen so that it is able to pay a large sum into the Treasury of the United States. But, certainly, Mr. President, that is no excuse for mulcting the people of New York in the conduct of the Government of the United States.

Mr. President, I wish to say, and I say it with great feeling, that what has been said here today by some of my colleagues on the floor of the Senate expresses a dangerous theory and a dangerous principle. As a Senator from New York, I wish to say that I have never hesitated to vote for large appropriations for many public projects, even for those which did not directly benefit my State.

I have voted for appropriations for power development in the South, in the West, and in the Northwest. I have

voted for appropriations for reclamation and irrigation projects, when none of those developments, Mr. President, directly benefited the State of New York. I have voted for inland waterway developments, the development of the great rivers of the West and the Middle West. I have voted for them realizing full well that they did not benefit directly the people of New York, and that I was subjecting myself frequently to criticism and blame. I voted for them nonetheless, whether they were in Mississippi, Tennessee, Texas, Idaho, Minnesota, or Oklahoma, on the theory that that which would serve the interests of one part of the country would serve the interests of every part of the country, including my own State of New York. I think I was right, and I hope I shall be able to follow the same course in the future.

I have voted for agricultural price supports—and I am looking now at the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. AIKEN]—when, after all, the agricultural price supports for which I have been willing to vote have provided very little benefits to the people of New York.

I repeat, that I have been willing to do those things because I believe we are a nation, not simply a federation of States. What helps California, Idaho, Arizona, New Mexico, Illinois, Minnesota, Tennessee, and Mississippi, serves the interests of my own State.

But, Mr. President, if we are going to legislate on the basis of how a particular bill affects one particular section of the country or one particular State, and are going to make it appear as if the people of that State were voting against the interests of the Nation, when, as a matter of fact, I am convinced that the old formula penalized the densely populated States, I can say, Mr. President, that the incentive to vote in the national interest rather than in the parochial interest, in the interest of a narrow area, will have been destroyed.

I believe the new formula is fair. I believe it is sound, and, so far as I am concerned, I certainly intend to vote against the Chavez amendment and in support of the committee bill which is pending before the Senate.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I am very much interested in the observations of the distinguished Senator from New York concerning the problems of construction costs in densely populated areas of the country. I wonder if the Senator is aware that when New Jersey built its now somewhat famous turnpike the construction costs in the northern end of the State, where there is dense population, ran, in some instances, as high as \$7 million or \$8 million a mile, whereas in my end of the State, where there is a sparsely populated area, the costs ran approximately three quarters of a million dollars a mile.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from New Jersey for drawing my attention to that part. I have before me a sheet showing the construction costs per mile in the various States. I find that in New Jersey the cost was the highest of

any State in the Union. I do not know the exact reason for that, but I do know that the connecting links between New Jersey and the populated areas of New York and Pennsylvania are very costly.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The heavy costs arise from the fact that in New Jersey it is necessary to have a large amount of bridge and overpass construction.

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes. The cost in New Jersey was \$2,105,000 a mile. The next highest cost was in New York, my own State, \$830,000 a mile.

My experience, like that of the Senator from New Jersey, has shown that many times the cost per mile is three or four times the average cost.

As against that, we find the cost in Arizona per mile—and these figures have been given to me by the committee; they are not mine—is \$81,000.

The cost in Nevada is \$36,200.

The cost in New Mexico, the State from which the sponsor of the amendment comes, is \$57,000.

The cost in Wyoming is \$62,000.

I could continue to read the costs in many other States throughout the Union. Compare the cost of \$36,200 in Nevada and the cost of \$57,000 in New Mexico with the cost of \$2,105,000 in New Jersey and \$830,000 in New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, this is primarily a national question, a question of the use of Federal money raised by Federal tax methods. None of us can regard it in any other light.

Ever since the beginning of the Federal-aid system, there has been a desire to use Federal gasoline tax money in the Federal program for the development of a Federal system of highways. Senators will remember that originally there was merely the Federal-aid road system. Then there was added a secondary system, to supply country areas. In 1944, it will be recalled, as a result of the troubles experienced in transportation in the cities during the war, there were added the urban systems.

Senators will recall that in the same year, 1944, largely as a result of the experience during the war, a system of interstate highways was created.

I shall not repeat what I have already stated in colloquy with my distinguished friend, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], who I am sorry is not now on the floor, but in 1941 President Roosevelt appointed a very able and distinguished Commission, which studied the subject during the war years. In 1944 the Commission reported in favor of setting up an interstate highway system, based largely on the war experience, and on the inadequacy of road or highway transportation as it had appeared during the war.

Senators will recall that of the system of strategic highways, designated as such by officials of the armed services during the war, provision was made for the construction of about half of the mileage of the strategic system, the most necessary half of that system. The system

set up to constitute the interstate highway system in 1944 consisted of something less than 40,000 miles, with a 40,000-mile limitation as the maximum which could be included, the objective being to include all the principal trunk connections, so as to enable access to and from every populated part of the country, so far as going to the hearts of the various States was concerned, and providing to the various population and industrial centers in every State of the Union.

Much was hoped from the urban system, and it has appeared that something could be done under it, but nothing like enough has been done to meet the critical needs at the bottlenecks of transportation, which are in the heavily congested centers of population.

Senators will remember that when we got into the Korean difficulty, it was necessary to pass a special access highway authorization and to make special appropriations under it, most of which were used. They were for circumferential routes around the heavy industry areas, designed to enable traffic to go to and from cities and facilities, either for the transportation of military supplies, or for reaching military bases in the neighborhood of the great cities.

So many reports have now come to the attention of the committees of the Senate and the House that the committees have been forced to a realization of the fact—and it is a national fact, Mr. President—that our highway system is not adequate; that its place of greatest inadequacy is in the heavy centers of population along the mileage of the interstate highway system.

So there have come before the committee various representatives from highly reputable bodies, who have stated it to be their view that the interstate highway system was the bottleneck and should be given the earliest and the most consideration. The President of the United States, in his budget message, made such an observation. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has already put the text of the President's message on that subject in the RECORD. Under Secretary of Commerce Robert B. Murray, Jr., appeared before our committee and testified, at page 38 of the record of the hearings, as follows:

The administration, while stepping up its participation generally throughout the Federal system, desires to place greater emphasis than before upon the deficiency in the interstate system.

It was with that in mind that I was last week instructed to inform the House that with one amendment in H. R. 7818, of which S. 2982 is a companion bill, the administration desired to support that bill as the administration bill, and I am here for that purpose today, Mr. Chairman.

The House bill, which was made the administration bill, included \$200 million for the interstate system, and provided for a matching basis of 60 percent of Federal money and 40 percent of State money. It also provided, in order to afford a basis for a real compromise between the so-called small States and the so-called great States, that 50 percent of the \$200 million should be allotted among the States on the basis of popu-

lation, and 50 percent on the time-honored basis provided by section 21 of the Federal-aid road bill, which is the basis applicable to the ordinary primary road-aid system. That was the administration measure.

Other strong recommendations came to us. For instance, there was the repeated recommendation of the American Association of State Highway Officials. Senators will find it referred to in various places in the RECORD, but it is stated in full from page 12 to page 19 of the record of the hearings.

Senators will find that the head of the Highway Department of the State of Arkansas, one of the States of large area and of relatively small population, appearing as president of the American Association of State Highway Officials, and speaking for 46 of the 48 States who had approved the recommendations, stated to the Senate committee exactly the basis of the recommendations. Mr. President, those recommendations will be found on pages 12, 17, 18, and 19 of the printed hearings. I shall not try to repeat them in detail in my remarks, but I call attention to two facts in them.

First, 46 of the 48 States recommended that \$250 million be appropriated for the interstate system, and they recommended that the basis of distribution be one of population, not for half of the total sum, but for all of it. They recommended, also, that the matching ratio be 75 percent of Federal money to 25 percent of State money.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Upon what basis did the highway commissioner and the organization of highway officials base their recommendation of the matching basis of 75 percent and 25 percent?

Mr. HOLLAND. I think it was based upon the fact that there had been a brief experience with the 75 percent-25 percent matching arrangement during some of the war years. I cannot give the exact years now. But the Senator will recall that during the war years a 75 percent-25 percent matching basis was set up for a short time. It proved to expedite the construction of some roads which were very badly needed, and which were a part of the system of roads we are now talking about.

Mr. GORE. During that wartime experience, was it not decided to place it upon a 75-25 percent basis because of the paramount national concern for the construction of those particular highways?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is exactly correct; and in order that I may make the reference entirely accurate, I wish to say that the act providing for the 75-25 matching funds was approved by President Roosevelt on December 26, 1941. That was shortly after Pearl Harbor. There was then provided the 75-25 percent arrangement for matching the funds which I have just mentioned to the Senate. So that the highway officials, drawing upon that war experience, which had proven effective in getting construction of expensive

roads at the time they were badly needed during the war, and with the concurrence of 46 of the 48 of the State highway commissions, made the recommendation to which I have referred. The situation now, as compared with then, while not identical with that existing during World War II, is in many respects comparable when the national security and defense are considered.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN. Will the Senator kindly explain the composition of the organization to which he has referred?

Mr. HOLLAND. The organization is the American Association of State Highway Officials. It consists of representatives from the highway departments of each of the States, the District of Columbia, and the Territories of Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. The Federal department has a membership and its representative sits in the meetings, but does not have a right to vote on this kind of matter.

Mr. MARTIN. That would make a total membership of about 52?

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe that is correct, with 51 members eligible to vote. As we were told in the committee by Mr. Johnson, the head of the highway department of the State of Arkansas, who was the witness, 46 of the 48 States were represented and voted favorably, and two States, which he mentioned as the States of New Mexico and Arizona, opposed it.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, so much for the recommendation of the highway officials of the Nation. While I know the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma was using his customary good humor when he indicated that some Senators might be allowing the highway departments of their States to write the ticket which they would use, I think it is very clear that Members of the Senate have never done that. I know of no Member of the Senate who does that. However, I hope the time will never come when a Member of the Senate will not have a right to resort to the skill, technical and practical assistance, and the excellent advice which as a rule is available from the career employees who make up the State highway departments of the several States. With a recommendation of this kind coming in, by the way, in writing, and then presented by Mr. Johnson, of the Highway Department of the State of Arkansas, the committee was greatly impressed, and I think the committee should have been greatly impressed.

Furthermore, the American Automobile Association was present with a strong delegation to make the same representation in favor of the interstate highway bill.

The American Municipal Association likewise was in favor of the bill, and told of the struggles and troubles in attempting to get in and out of great cities and large industrial areas.

In most instances, and I believe in every instance, these recommendations were much more generous than are the provisions contained in the Senate bill.

Most of the organizations wanted at least \$200 million for the interstate highway system. Some wanted as much as \$250 million, as I have already stated. Some wanted the 75-25 matching basis to be used. As I now recall, all these recommendations which reached the committee proposed more generous treatment for the big States than the bill provides. Far be it for me to plead always for the big States, but they are the ones we are hurting. They are the ones who have found it simply impossible, because of high costs, to complete their vital links in the interstate system.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Though the committee did not agree to the 75-25 matching formula which had been recommended to it, did not the committee approve a 60-40 basis of matching for the reason that in the interstate highway development, the national interest was paramount?

Mr. HOLLAND. It was exactly for that reason, and that was the same reason which motivated the Congress when, in 1941, it speeded the construction of some of the highways provided for by the act passed on December 26, 1941, to which I have already alluded.

Those who would try to make it appear that Senators are provincial in their viewpoints when they support the action of their committee I think are going very far astray. Some mention was made that the State of Florida happens to be, for the first time, by the way, in the group of States which are heavily populated. I have been on the other side of the situation prior to this bill. I am glad the State of Florida has had enough growth in recent years so that it has recently gotten over the line. However, I wish to make it clear for the record that Florida is so little over the line that the difference coming to Florida under one formula as compared to the other formula constitutes \$41,000, which, in terms of highway construction, is nothing, as Senators know. The Senator from Florida wishes to say for the benefit of his generous friends—who are not present as he speaks now—that he wishes them to recognize that the Senator from Florida is not supporting a bill which happens to serve his State, but is supporting a bill which he thinks is vital in the public interest.

When the aid-to-education bill was before the Senate on two occasions, it received a favorable vote on the floor of the Senate from the Senator from Florida. It has been previously stated by the Senator from Florida that Florida was one of the States not helped by the bill because Florida happens to have a high standard of pay for its teachers, and it needed no aid. So the Senator from Florida feels it is ungenerous when it is stated that he is supporting the bill because the State of Florida will re-

ceive a few dollars more under one allocation as compared to another.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I wish to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Florida for his broad thoughts and attitude in this regard.

I should like to take a moment to point out that the accusation or innuendo would not apply to the junior Senator from Tennessee, because it is my privilege to represent, in part, a State which will be, in some respects, by some interpretations, adversely affected by the change in formula. However, I would remind my colleagues who come from the less densely populated States, as I do, that we often ask our colleagues to vote for Federal appropriations from which the more densely populated States would not receive proportionate benefits. I wish to remind them that in legislation such as Federal aid to education, social security, and so forth, Senators from so-called poorer States are pleading for the levying of taxes on wealth and income wherever it exists for the benefit of people wherever they are. Can we not measure this bill by the same standard? The committee cannot properly be subject to the charge of being niggardly with the sparsely populated States. Let me remind the senior Senator from Florida that under the present system, in Nevada, for instance, the Federal Government now pays 84.14 percent of Federal highway construction. And when we add the 60-40 matching basis on the interstate system, we find that the Federal Government will contribute 87.30 percent of the money for the construction of all Federal-aid highways in that State. I do not cite this in disapproval but as an example to show that the committee has not dealt unfairly with sparsely populated States.

I send to the Senator from Florida a list which shows the situation in the case of many other States. For instance, in Arizona presently the percentage is 71.95. In Oregon, it is 66.11. Upon passage of this bill, these percentages will be increased.

So the bill will not in any way operate detrimentally to sparsely settled States. Indeed, through the recognition of public lands, Indian roads, area, and star route mileage, the sparsely settled States are given due recognition.

Here; however, we are considering a system of interstate, national highways, in connection with which we must give—as I see it—more regard to population because it is where the larger numbers of people live that 4-lane and 6-lane highways must be built and where the rights-of-ways are extremely expensive.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. His remarks are completely appropriate, and I believe them to be entirely true.

I know that in so far as his own position is concerned, it is, as he has suggested, against the interest of his State, although it happens that his State will not lose very much as a result of this proposal, and I am glad that is the case.

I desire to call to the attention of all Senators that several members of the Committee on Public Works have taken that position in the committee, and several members of the committee are now taking that position on the floor of the Senate, although their States are adversely affected by the provisions of the present bill.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Florida a question: Is it not true that it is in the interest of Tennessee and in the interest of all the other States to have an adequate, workable national system of interstate highways, and that the way to obtain it is by giving recognition to the need to allocate the most money to the places where the greatest need exists?

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course that is true. Any product originating in Tennessee and moving to the large centers of population must move through the bottlenecks we have been discussing. Any transportation of persons or materials from the great centers in Tennessee must make use of the highways in those bottlenecks.

As to the State of Florida, the same situation is true; and of course we market most of our products in the other States of the Union.

So, Mr. President, I think we would be taking an extremely shortsighted view if we were to think that our States would be helped only to the extent that Federal funds are to come to us under the provisions of this bill. A citizen of Tennessee or a citizen of any of the other States has, I believe, a national interest and a national viewpoint, and is perfectly willing to face the fact that in large segments of the Nation there are real bottlenecks in the national transportation system, and consequently a serious lack of adequate road construction, and they should receive aid in respect to such construction.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Florida will yield to me, let me ask him a question: Does he not think that a Senator who supports a proposal to authorize the appropriation of \$150 million for the national interstate highway system is taking the national view; and does not the Senator from Florida also believe that a Senator who votes in favor of a 60-40 matching basis in connection with the national interstate highway system is likewise taking the national point of view?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think such a Senator is then taking a viewpoint that is national and that applies to his State as much as it does to other States.

I remind the Senator from Mississippi that his State, for instance, has large mileage on the interstate system.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida does not seem to be able to get away from a consideration of what each Senator's State is to receive.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, let me say, also, that the 60-40 percent matching basis applies to every dime which will go to Mississippi, regardless of what formula is used. As regards the State of Mississippi and as regards

all the other States, including the State of Tennessee, the problem of constructing an adequate interstate highway system and providing for adequate interstate transportation is—as was so ably stated by the Senator from Tennessee—one of providing an interstate, national system which will be in accord with the proven needs of the Nation and the proven inadequacies of the present system. Certainly an adequate system of that sort has become of much more vital importance and applies to a situation involving much greater danger, because of the atomic- and hydrogen-bomb age in which we live.

Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate at great length. I merely wish to say that it seems to me this bill is a very excellent compromise, and recognizes both the interests of the large and sparsely settled States and the interests of the States where problems of large population and heavy traffic exist. Incidentally, at present most of the gasoline-tax funds come from the latter group of States.

Insofar as the question of the amount in issue in connection with the pending amendment is concerned, I wish to call attention again to the fact that we are not talking about a revolutionary change or a denial to States of what they have received heretofore. On the contrary, under the provisions of this bill we shall be giving, from Federal funds, more money for primary-road aid than has ever before been given, and more money for secondary-road aid than has ever before been given, and more money for urban-road aid than has ever before been given; and, also, we have not disturbed the basis of allotment in the case of any of those three excellent systems. To the contrary, in this bill we insist that 7½ percent, only, of the entire amount of authorization for each year shall be subjected to a new basis of distribution, so that in the bottlenecks the needed roads can be constructed more quickly and more nearly in accord with the very grave need now existing.

Mr. President, I have had prepared a table of figures based upon the fine table already appearing in the hearings, on page 66; but it carries that table one step further. I ask all my colleagues to follow the matter upon the one-sheet exhibit which I am having distributed to Senators at this time. They will note from the sheet—which, as I say, is taken from and is based upon the compilation appearing on page 66 of the hearings—the total mileage in the eight States where the problem is most acute, namely, the States of California, Illinois, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Texas, with an aggregate mileage on the interstate system of 10,967 miles, which is not quite one-third of the total mileage of the interstate system; it is 29.51 percent of the entire mileage. Senators will notice that these 8 States have 47.44 percent of the total population, or almost half the population of the Nation, and form a part of the Nation whose problems in this field are so great that the cost of completion of their parts of the interstate sys-

tem amounts to 51.74 percent of the cost of building the entire interstate system.

Those 8 States, which have 10,967 miles of the interstate highway system, are in a class by themselves, or are practically by themselves; there are a few other States that are nearly in the same classification. However, those eight States are in that classification simply because the congestion in parts of them is so great and because the cost of construction, due to that congestion, is so great.

Senators will note that in those States the cost per mile of construction varies from \$157,000, in the case of Texas, to \$2,105,000, in the case of New Jersey; and the average for the 8 States is \$532,000 a mile.

Mr. President, the fact is that the cost of that construction—which also includes the cost of acquiring the rights-of-way—is so prohibitive that in most of these States construction of the particular mileage that is most strategic and most necessary has not been undertaken at all.

In the colloquy earlier in the day I called attention to the fact that in New Jersey, where the construction cost is high, the State has been unable to attack the problem, even with the urban aid it has had; and in order to meet a part of the problem the State has funded bonds and has built a turnpike toll road which misses most of its cities, but which does carry people expeditiously across the State, making it possible easily to reach many important places.

The distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] brought into the record the figures appearing on page 222 of the printed record, showing that the cost of construction of the toll road in New Jersey was \$2.4 million a mile. That construction, of course, did not involve the heavy right-of-way costs which will be involved in some places when the interstate highway link in that State is built, extending from New York through Jersey City, Newark, and other cities, down to Philadelphia.

It is readily apparent that the problems in that group of States, which have an average cost of \$532,000 a mile for the construction of the remaining mileage in the interstate highway system in those various States, face a very difficult problem. I think the big States have been good sports. They have paid most of the gas tax through the years, and have seen most of the benefits go to the smaller States—among which I still include my own. They have been good Americans and good sports, and my hat is off to them.

I think they are within their rights when they now say, "Under the new situation which we confront, with the multiplied use of automobiles and trucks mounting so heavily, an entirely new kind of construction is required to handle the enormous volume of traffic. We simply cannot face the construction cost that is ours to meet in the event the Federal Government will not help us. We are asking that a more equitable basis of disposition of the gas-tax revenue be used, at least as to 7½ percent of the

entire amount which is covered by these authorizations."

If Senators will read down the list they will find that 15 other States, in all parts of the Union, are listed, with a total mileage in the interstate system of highways almost identical with the mileage in the 8 large States which I have mentioned. They will find that the average cost per mile in those 15 States is only \$92,000, as contrasted with \$532,000 per mile in the 8 large States which I have mentioned.

I think we might as well consider this matter from the standpoint that this is not a "pork barrel" bill. It should not be regarded as such. There is no justification for the continued existence of a Federal-aid system if we are to regard it on that basis. We must have a Federal system of highways which is adequate, and which will meet the very grave needs, both transportation and travelwise, as well as defensewise, which confront the Nation.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. GORE. If the bill were to be regarded as a "pork barrel" bill, would there, indeed, be a case to be made for an interstate system? Would we not still have the primary Federal-aid system, if it were to be considered strictly on the old matching basis?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct, of course. Congress first established the urban system as the main feature, taking off a part of the primary aid system and setting up the interstate system. During the war we applied emergency measures, through the construction of access highways. We have applied various means to meet the same problem, which bore down on us more critically in wartime. I hope it may never bear down upon us with the maximum critical pressure which is reached in time of war. However, we cannot assume that such will not be the case.

It is my hope that distinguished Senators will make up their minds to face this question from the standpoint of what is good for the entire Nation, what is needed by the entire Nation. I hope Senators will fully consider the recommendations of the President, the Budget Bureau, the Defense Department, the American Association of State Highway Officials, the American Automobile Association, and the American Municipal Association. They are all composed of great numbers of good Americans. If the problem receives such consideration, we can move forward to meet the critical need more quickly. I believe it is entirely in the national interest that we do just that.

Mr. President, I wish to make one further comment. The House had exactly the same kind of problem confronting it. Members of the House come from every State in the Union. Members of the House Public Works Committee confronted the problem. They decided that the wise thing to do was to meet it by allocating 50 percent of the appropriation for the interstate system under the new method which was suggested; namely, the population basis, and that the old

method be followed with respect to the other half.

When the bill came to the Senate many of us would have preferred to base the allocation of the entire amount of the interstate appropriation upon population. We discussed the question from all angles. There were various motions from various points of view. The majority of the committee finally reached the conclusion that the basis of 50-50 which had already been reached in the House was very hard to beat.

I wish every Senator could have been present earlier today to hear the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. His State is one which, from the standpoint of not receiving, under the population basis, what it would receive under the traditional basis, is worst hurt. His State is one of the few whose legislature had adopted a resolution addressed to its congressional delegation asking them not to support the bill.

The distinguished Senator from Arizona is the father of the Federal-aid system. The Hayden-Cartwright Act, which was the basis of the Federal system, bears his honored name. It will always be one of his claims to the greatest distinction, that back in 1916, when the first act was passed and the program established, he was able to think in terms of national interest. I think it is an additional feather in his cap that, notwithstanding the fact that he received from his own legislature and from other sources communications urging that he not approve the program, which is so clearly in the national interest, he rose in his place in the Senate today to say to the Senate that, although it has been a difficult decision for him to reach, he thought the national interest required that at least for a period of 2 years—so that we can see how the plan works—we should follow the recommendations of the experts which, in our opinion, would result in placing the roadbuilding program on a better basis. Coming, as he does, from a relatively small State in population and a large State in area, I think his view should be highly persuasive with Senators who may have doubt as to what is the proper thing for them to do under the circumstances.

There are many additional things which I should like to say, but time forbids. I conclude by reminding Senators that less than 40,000 miles is taken off the Federal aid primary system of 234,000 miles. That mileage is chosen by some of the ablest experts in the field as representing that part of the much larger mileage which serves, not State interests primarily, but primarily Federal and national interests. I believe that the improvement of that particular segment comprising the interstate highway system should be the particular regard of Senators who are serving the entire Nation, and who are looking at the whole problem while considering, always, the interests of their States. Primarily they view the problem from the standpoint of what is most needed for the service, and perhaps even for the salvation, the safety, the security of our country. I believe that if the problem is faced in that

way the pending amendment will be defeated and the bill reported by the committee will be approved.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table to which I have re-

ferred be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

National system of interstate highways

State	Mileage (miles)	Percent	Needs	Percent	Population (percent)	Cost per mile
California.....	1,900	5.11	\$1,169,427	10.38	7.02	\$616,000
Illinois.....	1,541	4.15	856,378	7.60	5.78	556,000
Michigan.....	962	2.59	416,399	3.70	4.23	433,000
New Jersey.....	192	.52	404,053	3.59	3.21	2,105,000
New York.....	1,034	2.78	862,261	7.65	9.84	830,000
Ohio.....	1,216	3.27	758,591	6.73	5.27	623,000
Pennsylvania.....	1,357	3.65	926,579	8.22	6.97	678,000
Texas.....	2,765	7.44	435,988	3.87	5.12	157,000
Total.....	10,967	29.51	5,829,676	51.74	47.44	532,000
Alabama.....	891	2.40	87,976	0.78	2.03	98,600
Arizona.....	1,137	3.06	92,108	.82	.50	81,000
Colorado.....	662	1.78	72,294	.64	.88	109,000
Idaho.....	617	1.66	50,243	.45	.39	81,800
Iowa.....	670	1.80	78,349	.70	1.74	117,000
Kansas.....	702	1.89	89,783	.80	1.26	128,000
Mississippi.....	691	1.86	88,140	.78	1.45	127,500
Nebraska.....	461	1.24	48,239	.43	.88	104,500
Nevada.....	537	1.45	19,568	.17	.11	36,200
New Mexico.....	1,013	2.72	58,110	.52	.45	57,300
North Carolina.....	713	1.92	72,857	.65	2.70	102,000
North Dakota.....	498	1.34	45,151	.40	.41	90,500
South Dakota.....	515	1.39	44,835	.40	.43	87,400
Utah.....	704	1.89	84,253	.75	.46	120,000
Wyoming.....	973	2.62	60,070	.53	.19	62,000
Total.....	10,784	29.02	991,976	8.82	13.88	92,000

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I shall certainly not detain the Senate very long. I believe that some points ought to be made, in more or less summary, with reference to the pending amendment. I should like to preface my remarks with a word of personal appreciation, which I believe is shared by every Member of this body, to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, for the fine contribution he has made in the consideration of the very broad problem of a sound national highway system.

At times I call him Mr. Economy, because I know he is deeply concerned with budgetary matters and votes conservatively along that line. However, after he made a special study of the highway needs of the Nation during the past year, knowing that this bill would come before the Senate, he certainly rose to the occasion and now is leading the fight for a bill recommending an increase in authorizations of almost 100 percent over what was authorized heretofore. I commend him very highly for what I consider to be his very sound position, and I know he conscientiously considers it to be so.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. I appreciate the comment of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. Every one of us has a hobby so far as governmental matters are concerned. I have always preached economy in government, but I have also at all times advocated the appropriation of large sums of money for national defense. After a very careful and thorough study, I believe the primary matter of importance today is the construction of highways, because they will do more than anything else to unite us

as a nation. I appreciate the complimentary remarks of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I wish also to commend the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who served as chairman of the subcommittee which prepared the bill. He worked with his usual inexhaustible energy in conducting the hearings and in preparing the bill and in presenting it to the Senate. I know he has taken an unselfish view of all these matters, and we owe him a special debt of gratitude.

Perhaps I should say also that we had very amiable discussions in committee during the consideration of the bill, and there was never any suggestion about pork-barrel legislation, or anything of that nature. Almost all the major matters were considered and voted on unanimously.

I believe that on the point which I am now discussing there was only 2 or 3 minutes of discussion, and the vote on it was 6 to 5. It has not been discussed in adequate debate. Certainly there was no division on personal grounds in committee; there was merely a difference of opinion as to how the funds should be apportioned.

With reference to the military needs to which reference has been made, I do not remember any bill of major importance that has come before the Senate, especially since the Korean war began, with respect to which it has not been stated that it is bottomed on national defense. That is natural and proper with reference to many measures.

It should be remembered, in connection with the national defense program, that we will be called upon, as we are already being called upon, to appropriate hundreds of millions of dollars to provide special defenses for our great populous areas, and properly so. The Committee

on Armed Services has before it bills for the approval of projects which run into hundreds of millions of dollars for special devices and designs in connection with special defenses for our populous areas, the expense for which will be borne by the Federal Government. That is as it should be. Therefore those areas are getting very proper consideration on the subject of defense.

There is already in existence a highway from Washington to Baltimore, half of which, to Fort Meade, as I understand, was built entirely with Federal funds as a part of the national defense. In addition, \$53 million worth of military access roads have been authorized, for which the demand is not sufficiently great to force appropriations for them. So, Mr. President, there is no great suffering along that line.

The whole national road system is on a defense basis, and very properly so. I believe the primary road system is also in that category. I wish to point out that the interstate system, after all, is nothing more than a special part of the primary system. Only the name is different for the more populous and the most heavily traveled stretches of the primary system. It has no particular military significance. The so-called interstate system is no more connected with the military defense than are other segments of the primary system, although it is an important and a very highly important part of defense. There is merely a difference of name.

I favor the interstate system. I have voted for \$150 million of the total authorization to be specially set aside for this superprimary system called the interstate system. I voted for the provision under which the Federal Government will pay 60 percent of the cost and the States 40 percent of the cost.

What I balk at is going the third mile—not the second mile, but the third mile—in setting up a special formula for half of the money provided for the interstate system. Mark my words, Mr. President, 2 years from now the same argument and the same points will be made in favor of having all the money appropriated for interstate roads apportioned on a population basis, and the proponents will point to this law, if it is passed as proposed by the committee, as a precedent for allotting funds for the interstate system entirely on a population basis.

Therefore I do not believe it is a matter of pork barrel considerations, but it is a matter of the other areas of the country having fair warning that this is a material departure, and that we had better look closely before we go any further.

In that connection I point out that this superprimary system—and that is what the interstate system is—is to get 42 percent of the increased amount in the pending billion dollar Federal-aid bill. In the House bill it gets 88 percent of the increase. Certainly that is a considerable favor to the so-called interstate system. I approved of it; I went that far.

In addition to that, according to the present rate of expenditure, the so-called

interstate system will get 34 percent of the funds for the primary highways designated in the bill. Under the present figures, that will amount to \$116.2 million. The so-called interstate system will also get 46 percent of the urban funds, and, according to the figures in the bill that will amount to \$87.4 million, to which may be added \$150 million which we are specially marking for the interstate fund. So a total of \$353.6 million is to go to this relatively small group of highways in the specially designated primary system, which is the cream, one might say, of the primary system; \$353.6 million, of a total of \$910 million, would go for that purpose, according to the present provisions of the bill.

Mr. CASE. Will the Senator agree with me that whatever portion of the primary road money of any State or whatever portion of the urban money of any State that goes to the interstate system will be entirely within the discretion of the local State highway commission which makes proposals for the allocation of funds?

Mr. STENNIS. They have a part in the decision. I am standing on what is the present practice. It is reasonably to be expected that we shall continue under it. So, in answer to the charge of pork-barrelism, I point out that \$353.6 million of the \$910 million in this bill for Federal aid can, and, under present practices, will go to the interstate highway system. One hundred and fifty million dollars of that will be on a basis of matching it 60 percent by the Federal Government and 40 percent by the local governments.

As I have already pointed out, under the House bill 88 percent of the increase in the bill would go to the interstate system, and it is fair to calculate, at least, that in conference the Senate figure will be increased in part to meet the higher figure of the House. It will make the number of millions of dollars spent on the Federal interstate system even higher. That is why I say if we are to keep it in equilibrium we must make a national highway system out of it, rather than to pour money into particular areas. I agree that there is great need in certain areas but I say that if we are going to follow the practice of improving highways throughout the Nation, we had better stick by a formula which would spread the money out further than the formula in the bill appears to do.

Someone has said that where the money is needed is in the populous areas, and it is said that in the rural areas it does not cost much to build roads. Mr. President, we already have a special fund to build primary highways in populous areas. They are urban funds. It seems to me that the proper way to get at the matter of the large increase in costs in populous areas would be to have a scientific survey made of the actual need, and then to consider on its merits the problem of increasing the urban funds, expanding their application, putting more money into the funds, and applying it where the need is the greatest.

Mr. President, there has never been any scientific congressional selection so far as the interstate highway system is

concerned. I suppose some good efforts went into it. I am not impugning the motives of the Bureau of Public Roads or of the State highway officials, but so far Congress has never gone right down to the merits and the facts of the matter. I am not complaining about my own State, but so far as any congressional action with reference to this system is concerned, it has never been undertaken.

Mr. President, I should like to read from the annual report of the Bureau of Public Roads for the fiscal year 1953. From the top of page 6 of that report, beginning with the third sentence on that page, I read:

In a survey of the condition of the rural portion of the interstate system it was found that only 24 percent of the mileage was adequate for present traffic.

There is no doubt, Mr. President, that rural areas have their problems, too, but on the basis of a survey—not a resolution passed in the dying minutes of a convention—it was found that only 24 percent of the mileage was adequate for present traffic, and no consideration was given to future traffic. It was found that 76 percent was in need of improvement or reconstruction. The report goes on to say:

On 16 percent of the mileage the need was considered critical.

Those are the words of the Bureau of Public Roads, showing the absolute need for money for expansion, for rebuilding or reconstruction or widening, or whatever the case may be, of more than three-quarters of the rural mileage of the interstate system.

On the same subject, Mr. President, I point to a picture in the annual report, showing a fine highway going over the summit of Sherman Hill, in Wyoming, the high summit on United States Route No. 30. That picture is worth looking at. The cost of construction of a highway such as that, many, many miles of which are found in the West, is tremendous. It is not a local road; it is an interstate highway, a part of the interstate system.

I admit that there are problems in populous areas, but there are problems in rural areas, also. It requires a large amount of money to build roads in Wyoming and in many other places in the country.

So, Mr. President, I feel that we had better not disturb this ancient landmark. Let us make a survey and place the money where the need is found, but let us not disturb the situation and set a precedent and discontinue the use of a formula which has been proved by and large to be very sound.

I submit, Mr. President, that the amendment should be voted into the bill and we should let the bill go to conference. There it will meet head-on the apportionment made by the House. If there needs to be any further discussion of it, then the conferees, with the vote of the Senate behind them, can work out with the House a sound basis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing the percentage of Federal contributions to highway construction in certain Western States.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Sliding-scale rates of Federal-aid participation in public-land States effective Dec. 1, 1950

State	Ratio of the area of unappropriated and unserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands to the total area of the State ¹	Percentage of cost of Federal-aid projects payable by the Federal Government
Arizona.....	0.4390	71.95
California.....	.1657	58.28
Colorado.....	.1319	56.60
Idaho.....	.2192	60.96
Montana.....	.1406	57.03
Nevada.....	.6827	84.14
New Mexico.....	.2803	64.02
Oklahoma.....	.0553	52.76
Oregon.....	.2422	62.11
South Dakota.....	.1226	56.13
Utah.....	.4756	73.78
Washington.....	.0735	53.63
Wyoming.....	.2983	64.92

¹ Area data as of June 30, 1950, furnished by Department of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] for himself and other Senators. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Goldwater	Malone
Anderson	Gore	Mansfield
Barrett	Green	Martin
Beall	Griswold	Maybank
Bennett	Hayden	McCarran
Bricker	Hendrickson	McClellan
Burke	Hennings	Millikin
Bush	Hickenlooper	Morse
Butler, Md.	Hill	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Murray
Byrd	Holland	Neely
Capehart	Humphrey	Pastore
Carlson	Hunt	Payne
Case	Ives	Potter
Clements	Jackson	Purtell
Cooper	Jenner	Russell
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Daniel	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kefauver	Stennis
Duff	Kennedy	Thye
Dworshak	Kerr	Upton
Eastland	Kilgore	Watkins
Ellender	Knowland	Welker
Ferguson	Kuchel	Wiley
Flanders	Langer	Williams
Frear	Lehman	Young
Fulbright	Long	
Gillette	Magnuson	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent because of death in his family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], for himself and other Senators.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to speak very briefly in support of the amendment. We have before us a road bill which, in general, is a good bill, save and except that it does not begin to authorize the amount of money which we ought to be appropriating.

The bill does not authorize the amount of money which should be appropriated to meet the immediate road needs of the country. The figure should be much higher, in view of the economic conditions of the country and the importance of our proceeding to take action now which will avoid increases in unemployment, come October, November, and December of this year, and the first part of next year, after the seasonal pick-up which can be expected during the summer months has run its course.

As a member of the Committee on Public Works, I proposed an amendment to this bill in committee which provided for \$1,875,000,000. In my opinion, that was the bare minimum amount which the committee should bring to the Senate for consideration. I did not think even that amount was enough, but I had hopes that the committee would be willing to go that far this year. My amendment was defeated in committee.

It is true that the bill provides for some increase over the last appropriation, but, in my judgment, it is not nearly enough when the following facts are considered.

It is impossible to find a highway expert testifying before congressional committees these days—at least, I have heard none, nor have I read the testimony of any such witness—who does not vouch for the fact that there is needed \$35 billion to be used for the highways of this country if we are going to get them in a condition to take care of the traffic needs and uses of this country.

We now have an automobile population totalling 1 car for every 3 persons in the United States. This large automobile population places a tremendous load on the highways of America.

When Senators bear in mind that last year a little over 38,000 fellow Americans were killed on the highways, and several times that number were injured seriously or maimed, it seems to me that objectivity and statesmanship call for our meeting the problem of highway needs by appropriating the money which help reduce highway deaths and injuries. The amount of \$1,875,000,000 which I

proposed in committee is certainly small enough. In fact highway experts point out that the primary cause of highway accidents is the inadequacy of our roads to handle the traffic safely.

When one takes into account the need for a road-building public-works program, from the standpoint of stopping the fire of a serious recession before it really gets started, it seems to me that is added reason for the kind of amendment which I advocated and lost in committee.

Speaking now to the particular amendment before the Senate at this time, the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], of which I am one of the cosponsors, I feel that the existing law, as far as the apportionment of funds for the so-called interstate system is concerned, is an equitable law. I think an arrangement of one-third based on mileage, one-third on population, and one-third on area is about as equitable and as fair an apportionment as can be made, particularly when one keeps in mind the fact that there is a provision in the law for so-called urban funds to be used for urban highways.

Therefore, Mr. President, because I think that is a fair and equitable amendment, I urge the Senate to retain the present distribution of interstate funds and modify the bill in accordance with the Chavez amendment. The proposed modification of the existing formula as contained in the committee bill would cost my State a loss of a good many thousands of dollars. The amendment I am cosponsoring under the authorship of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] would protect Oregon's fair share to interstate highway funds under the existing law and in accordance with its terms. I think it is unfair to change the formula for dividing up interstate road funds because the proposal of the committee discriminates against States of small population such as Oregon and some other Western States. However our roads are costly to build and we have to build many more miles of them than do the smaller but more populated States. Therefore in fairness to the rural areas I hope the Chavez amendment passes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I have had plenty of vocal exercise the last couple of days, and I am not anxious to make any further remarks. I think the issue has been thoroughly debated. I hope the Senate will support the bill reported by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] for himself and other Senators. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceed to call the roll.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. FERGUSON (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If the senior Senator from New Mexico were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore I withhold my vote.

Mr. GORE (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the junior Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MONRONEY). If the junior Senator from Oklahoma were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. MAGNUSON (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If the junior Senator from Florida were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay," and the Senator from Alabama would vote "yea."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent because of a death in his family.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—37

Anderson	Humphrey	McClellan
Barrett	Hunt	Millikin
Bennett	Jackson	Morse
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Stennis
Dworshak	Kerr	Thye
Eastland	Kilgore	Watkins
Fulbright	Langer	Welker
Gillette	Malone	Wiley
Goldwater	Mansfield	Young
Hennings	Maybank	
Hill	McCarran	

NAYS—44

Aiken	Capehart	Ellender
Beall	Carlson	Flanders
Bricker	Case	Frear
Burke	Cooper	Green
Bush	Dirksen	Griswold
Butler, Nebr.	Douglas	Hayden
Byrd	Duff	Hendrickson

Hickenlooper	Kuchel	Potter
Hoey	Lehman	Purtell
Holland	Long	Saltonstall
Ives	Martin	Schoeppel
Jenner	Mundt	Smith, Maine
Kefauver	Neely	Upton
Kennedy	Pastore	Williams
Knowland	Payne	

NOT VOTING—15

Bridges	Gore	Robertson
Butler, Md.	Lennon	Smathers
Chavez	Magnuson	Smith, N. J.
Ferguson	McCarthy	Sparkman
George	Monroney	Symington

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the so-called Chavez amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEALL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I offer the two technical, brief amendments which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, in line 18, it is proposed to strike out the words "The Commissioner of Public Roads" and insert "The Secretary of Commerce."

On page 11, in line 19, after the word "study," it is proposed to insert: "of the costs of completing the several systems of highways in the several States and."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the first amendment I have offered will make a change from designation of the Commissioner of Public Roads to designation of the Secretary of Commerce, as suggested by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

The second amendment will include in the paragraph providing for a study of highway financing a specific request that the study of highway financing to be made by the Bureau of Public Roads shall include a study of the costs of completing the several systems of highways—the primary, secondary, and urban—in the several States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments submitted by the Senator from South Dakota.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I offer on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] the amendment which lies at the desk, and I ask to have the amendment stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 16, after line 7, it is proposed to insert the following:

Sec. 22. (a) That all Federal-aid road funds heretofore paid on the section of Fed-

eral-aid Primary Route No. 39 included in Federal-aid Project UI-147 in the State of Connecticut, which section is to be made a part of a highway from the New York State line at Greenwich to the Rhode Island State line at Killingly, planned as an expressway authorized by chapter 107, part IV, general statutes of Connecticut, 1953 supplement, shall, prior to the collection of any tolls on said section, be repaid to the Treasurer of the United States, and the amount so repaid shall be deposited to the credit of the appropriation for Federal-aid highways. At the time of such repayment, the project agreement with respect to said Federal-aid project UI-147 shall be canceled. Any amount so repaid, together with the unpaid balance of any amount programed for expenditure on said project, shall be credited to the unprogramed balance of Federal-aid road funds of the same class last apportioned to the State of Connecticut. The amount so credited shall be in addition to all other funds then apportioned to said State and shall be available for expenditure in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 212), as now or hereafter amended and supplemented.

"(b) By virtue of the design and plan of said highway in relation to the three sections of Federal-aid primary route No. 1 included in Federal-aid projects UI-29, UI-64, and FI-145, which permit unrestricted use of said sections without payment of tolls, it is hereby declared that the incorporation of said sections into said highway will not violate any provision of said Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, or any regulation thereunder. If at any time the Highway Commissioner of the State of Connecticut shall determine to impose tolls upon or for the use of any one or more of said sections, all Federal-aid road funds theretofore paid or programed for expenditure on such section or sections upon which tolls are to be imposed, shall be transferred for programing and expenditure in cooperation with the Connecticut State Highway Department pursuant to the provisions of said Federal Highway Act, as now or hereafter amended and supplemented. At the time of such transfer, the project agreement with respect to the project for which the funds are transferred shall be canceled. Upon such cancellation, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to credit the Federal pro-rata share of such project agreement to the unprogramed balance of Federal-aid road funds of the same class last apportioned to the State of Connecticut. The amount so credited shall be in addition to all other funds then apportioned to said State and shall be available for expenditure in accordance with the provisions of said Federal Highway Act, as now or hereafter amended and supplemented. In lieu of the transfer thereof, the Highway Commissioner of the State of Connecticut may repay the Federal-aid road funds paid on any such section in the same manner and with the same effect, as is provided with respect to the repayment of Federal-aid road funds in section 1 of this act.

(c) Upon the repayment or transfer of Federal-aid road funds, as hereinbefore provided, any such section or sections included in the project with respect to which such repayment or transfer is made, shall become and be free from any and all restrictions contained in said Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, or any regulation thereunder, with respect to the imposition and collection of tolls or other charges thereon or for the use thereof.

Renumber succeeding section.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. BUSH. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. KILGORE. Has this amendment ever been printed for distribution? I have been trying to find a copy of it.

Mr. BUSH. I think I can explain the amendment very briefly to the Senator. It has not been printed, but I think I can explain it very satisfactorily in a few moments.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CASE. The amendment was printed in the form of a bill.

Mr. BUSH. The amendment which I offer was printed in the form of a bill, Senate bill 796, or rather, a substitute for that bill, which has been printed for some time and is on the calendar.

For the purposes which I shall explain in a moment, I offer the bill as an amendment to the pending bill. I venture to say that if the Senator from West Virginia will allow me a few moments, he will be satisfied with the reasons why I am offering it as an amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BUSH. I yield for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. Would not this amendment practically completely reverse the traditional Federal-aid policy of the United States in connection with highway construction?

Mr. BUSH. No. I think if the Senator will hear me out he will agree that it would not reverse any policy.

Mr. President, the amendment which I offer on behalf of my distinguished colleague from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] and myself is needed to facilitate the financing and construction of a \$400 million toll expressway in the State of Connecticut.

It would help to accomplish a saving of approximately \$17 million for the people of my State and the motoring public at large by permitting the incorporation into the expressway of four sections of highway upon which Federal-aid funds have been or are being expended. Unless this legislation were enacted Connecticut would be faced with the alternative of constructing duplicating sections of highway which would cost that amount and possibly more. This would be a burdensome and wasteful expenditure of public funds, and would postpone full use of the expressway.

The amendment would allow the State to lift the mortgage on a Federal-aid project in the harbor area of New Haven on which tolls are to be charged. This would be done by repayment in cash of the Federal-aid funds to the United States and their transfer for use on other projects eligible for Federal aid.

The amendment provides for the same procedure in the event that the State should find it necessary to charge tolls on sections of expressway which include three other Federal-aid projects—in Darien, in the Grannis corner section of New Haven, and in the towns of Old Lyme and East Lyme.

There is precedent for this procedure in a law enacted by the 81st Congress to facilitate the construction of the New Jersey Turnpike.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. If I may complete my statement, I shall be glad to yield.

This amendment has been approved by the Committee on Public Works and by the Department of Commerce and the Bureau of the Budget. I know of no opposition to the amendment.

The amendment originally was drafted as a substitute for S. 796. Its adoption at the present time is necessary because time is of the essence in regard to the State of Connecticut's plans for issuing the expressway bonds.

I ask unanimous consent that the reports of the Department of Commerce and the Bureau of the Budget on the amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C., April 2, 1954.

Hon. EDWARD MARTIN,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your letter of March 12, 1954, requesting the views of this Department upon an amendment in the nature of a substitute for S. 796, a bill to permit the charging of tolls on certain highways constructed with Federal aid, which has been proposed by Senator BUSH.

The proposed amendment in the nature of a substitute is designed to permit the State of Connecticut to impose tolls on four sections of highway on which Federal-aid funds have been or are being expended. The amendment would make this possible by authorizing the State to repay or transfer the Federal-aid funds authorized for expenditure or expended on the Federal-aid projects in question, to other projects in the State eligible for Federal aid.

Under chapter 107, part IV, General Statutes of Connecticut, 1953 Supplement, the Connecticut Legislature has authorized the highway commissioner of the State to establish and construct an expressway which may be financed in whole or in part by means of tolls. The proposed expressway would not be a toll road in the usual sense in that certain sections of the expressway route would be available to the public without payment of tolls. Because of the numerous interchanges on the route and the small number of toll stations proposed, it will be possible for the highway user to enter and leave the expressway and to use portions thereof free of toll charges.

The State of Connecticut desires to incorporate into the expressway certain sections of road now located on Federal-aid Primary Routes 1 and 39. These sections have already been constructed, or are now being constructed, with Federal-aid funds.

One such section, namely, project UI-147 on Federal-aid Primary Route 39 in the harbor area of New Haven, is to be included in a section of the expressway on which tolls are to be charged. In view of the inhibition against tolls as contained in section 9 of the Federal Highway Act, it is not considered legally possible for the State of Connecticut to charge tolls on this section in the absence of congressional enactment. With respect to the other sections, namely, Federal-aid projects UI-29, UI-64, and FI-145 which are located on Federal-aid Primary Route 1 in Darien, in the Graniss corner section of New Haven, and in the towns of Old Lyme and East Lyme, respectively, the Department is informed by the State of Connecticut that under present plans the unrestricted

use of these sections is to be permitted without payment of tolls and that adequate interchanges will permit an uninterrupted flow of traffic on free Federal-aid Primary Route 1. On such basis it would not appear that there would be any conflict with the toll free provisions of the Federal Highway Act notwithstanding the fact that these same sections are also incorporated as part of the expressway. The possibility exists, however, that the State of Connecticut may desire at a later date to impose tolls upon any one or more of these sections and accordingly provision should be made for this eventuality.

In order that the above-described situation may be resolved so as to eliminate any conflict with section 9 of the Federal Highway Act, legislation is considered necessary to provide for repayment or transfer by the State of Connecticut with respect to the Federal-aid funds heretofore authorized and paid on the projects referred to, for use on other projects eligible for Federal aid. Such repayment or transfer would not result in any gain or loss of Federal-aid funds to Connecticut and would retain the Federal investment in toll-free highways, in conformity with section 9 of the Federal Highway Act.

There is a precedent for such action in Public Law 646 81st Congress, approved August 3, 1950, permitting Federal-aid funds authorized for expenditure on New Jersey State Route 100, which became a part of the New Jersey turnpike, to be transferred to another highway project in New Jersey eligible for Federal aid.

The proposed amendment accompanying your letter would generally accomplish the above objective, but certain changes and technical refinements therein are considered essential; for example, to give assurance that the Federal-aid funds so repaid or transferred would be subject to the matching requirements and all other provisions of the Federal-aid highway legislation governing the expenditure of the particular class of funds involved. There is attached a revised draft bill which incorporates these necessary changes.

The Department favors the enactment of the attached revised draft of bill.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that it would interpose no objection to the submission of this letter.

If we can be of further assistance in this matter, please call on us.

Sincerely yours,

SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., April 5, 1954.

Hon. EDWARD MARTIN,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
United States Senate, Senate Office
Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your letter of March 12, 1954, requesting the views of this office with respect to an amendment, in the nature of a substitute for S. 796, a bill "To permit the charge of tolls on certain highways constructed with Federal aid."

In its report of June 26, 1953, to your committee, this office recommended against the enactment of S. 796 for reasons set forth in that report. The representatives of the Department of Commerce also testified in opposition to S. 796. The proposed amendment in the nature of a substitute is intended to overcome the objections to S. 796 previously expressed.

This office perceives no objection in substance to the proposed amendment. Its application would be limited to four designated Federal-aid projects, upon which tolls may be charged by the State of Connecticut after repayment to the Federal Government or transfer to other Federal-aid projects of

Federal-aid funds expended or to be expended on the four sections involved. However, in order to assure that funds so transferred or repaid shall be expended under all applicable provisions of the Federal Highway Act and to simplify the budgeting and accounting procedures involved, a number of changes in the proposed amendment are regarded as necessary. The report of the Secretary of Commerce on the proposed amendment attaches a revised draft bill which is intended to accomplish these nonsubstantive changes.

This office has no objection to the enactment of the revised draft bill submitted by the Secretary of Commerce as a substitute for the proposed amendment.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD R. BELCHER,
Assistant Director.

Mr. BUSH. I now yield to my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the bill which the Senator from Connecticut originally introduced met with opposition on the part of some members of the Public Works Committee. The junior Senator from Tennessee was one of those who signed minority views in opposition to the bill. The distinguished Senator very generously reconsidered his bill and, by his revisions, he has met all the objections which the junior Senator from Tennessee had to the bill. When the able Senator asked the Public Works Committee to reconsider the question, I believe his bill, after the amendments to which the Senator agreed were made, received unanimous support. I wish now to join the able Senator from Connecticut in support of his amendment. I think it preserves the basic principles, failure to which caused objections to be made and minority views to be filed with respect to the original bill.

Will not the distinguished Senator explain to the Senate the differences between the amendment now offered and the bill which he originally introduced?

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, my bill was originally introduced last year. I am a little rusty on it, because the bill has been extensively revised.

In a general way, the bill originally applied to all States, giving them the same rights as are contemplated in the present amendment with respect to Connecticut. That seemed to be very broad authority. The bill has now been boiled down to meet a specific situation.

A further difference from the original bill is that the pending amendment involves payment in cash to the United States Government by the State of Connecticut of the so-called mortgage. I call it a mortgage for simplicity. The amendment provides that Connecticut shall pay in cash the amount of Federal-aid funds on the section of the road which we wish to incorporate in the expressway right-of-way and on which we desire to charge tolls. It also gives an option with respect to the other three sections of the road which will be incorporated, and with respect to which the Federal aid has been or is being extended, but on which no toll stations will be placed at the outset. However, if the traffic pattern should change over the years, and it should be desired to place one or more additional toll stations on the expressway to cover one or more of

the three sections, we would have the option, under this amendment, to pay off the so-called mortgage by paying cash into the Treasury, for allocation elsewhere in connection with a Federal-aid project.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Does not the Senator's amendment follow the precedent set in the State of New Jersey in the construction of a toll highway there?

Mr. BUSH. The Senator is exactly correct. A precedent was set by the 81st Congress in connection with the New Jersey Turnpike.

Mr. GORE. Is it not true that if the bill as originally introduced had been enacted a new and different policy would have been adopted?

Mr. BUSH. I think the Senator is quite correct. I thank him very much for bringing out that point.

Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate only a moment more.

This is a very important matter. It involves the expenditure of \$400 million in the State of Connecticut within the next few years. It involves 129 miles of expressway. This expressway is paralleled throughout by free roads which are now extant and will continue in existence. As the Senator from Tennessee has so generously pointed out, the amendment has been approved without opposition by the Public Works Committee. I take occasion at this point to thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, and also the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who have given me a great deal of advice in connection with this subject, both last year and this year. They make it possible for me to put the amendment in acceptable form.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to have the RECORD made clear by asking the distinguished Senator from Connecticut if his amendment is not identical with Calendar No. 703, S. 796, except for the amendments which have been worked out as a result of discussions with Senators on the other side of the aisle? Otherwise, is not the bill identical with the one I had given notice would be called up as the next measure to be considered?

Mr. BUSH. The Senator is absolutely correct. I thank him for bringing up that point.

I wish to make particular acknowledgment to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, and to the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], both of whom have been particularly helpful in working out the proposed amendment.

I have about concluded my remarks. I merely wish to add that the purpose of the amendment is to give to the State of Connecticut the privilege of lifting the mortgage on the one section, and on the

other sections also, if it should be necessary to do so.

The purpose of offering the amendment at this time, instead of letting it come up in the form of a bill later, is because of the time element involved. I feel we will save considerable time if the Senate will accept the pending amendment to the bill, instead of making it necessary to go through the procedure of having the distinguished majority leader bring it up separately.

I very much hope that the Senate will adopt the amendment.

No appropriations are called for. However, the adoption of the amendment would make available \$400 million with which to do a job that would improve travel conditions for the people of the country, not only the people of my own State, for it would affect many people who travel through Connecticut. Furthermore, it would provide employment, and certainly improve the safety and convenience of travel in our neighborhood, and add to the comfort and convenience and safety of those whom we welcome into our State every year.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the committee will be very glad to take the amendment to conference. It has been very well explained by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut and the very distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. It is agreeable to us to take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] for himself and his colleague [Mr. PURTELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment 4-6-54-A.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 15, after line 15, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 19. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 10 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 162), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That \$50,000,000 of the sums heretofore and herein authorized for the purposes of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 765), as amended and supplemented, shall be available for contract immediately upon the passage of this Act.

Renumber succeeding section numbers.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the amendment I have offered adds a new section to the bill, to provide some limited funds for the purpose of constructing or improving circumferential, or by-pass highways, around a city, or radial highways within a city, when such highways are designated as being important for civilian or military defense. The Secretary of Defense, or such other official as the President may designate, has the power to make the determination of whether or not such a highway is important to civilian or military defense.

In fiscal terms, the amendment provides an additional authorization of \$10,000,000. It also provides for contract authority for \$50,000,000 of the money pre-

viously and presently authorized for this purpose. Approximately \$53,000,000 of unused authorizations are available for this purpose from previous authorizations by the Congress.

Mr. President, let me take a minute to outline the nature of the highways which are contemplated under this section. The radial intracity highways called for would be direct highways leading directly away from the heart of our large cities and out into the rural area. Such highways are recognized as being essential today for the evacuation of cities in the event of an enemy attack. Furthermore, they are essential now in the everyday course of travel in our cities. Any one who drives home from downtown in any American city at 5:30 p. m. feels pretty sure he could make good use of the type of highway called for in this section.

As evacuation highways in case of an attack, these roads would also be available to bringing in rescue and disaster teams after such an attack, or in case of any other emergency.

The circumferential, or by-pass, highways also contemplated in this section will serve similar purposes, and they are also of essential importance in the conduct of normal business every day.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Michigan that I am glad he has offered his amendment. During the hearings on the bill we were told that there were access roads, to the extent of \$14 million worth of projects, which have been certified as important to the national defense and for which no funds are available.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan will make it possible to proceed with the construction of the defense access roads for which certification has already been provided by the using agency.

In addition to that, it places an emphasis upon arterial and circumferential highways for which authorization was specifically carried in the 1952 act, and as to which I have spoken several times on the floor of the Senate.

I hope the amendment will be agreed to. I should like to have the chairman of the committee take the amendment to conference.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I shall be very glad to take the amendment to conference. Personally, after the hearings we have had, I believe it is a very valuable addition to the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Unfortunately, the Senator from Mississippi was unable to attend the short meeting of the committee when the pending amendment was approved yesterday, as I understand. It was not discussed during the writing up of the bill. As I understand, it would renew the authority for the so-called access roads to the extent of \$50 million.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. And add \$10 million to it?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. The actual amount is \$53 million, but we are not asking for the additional \$3 million.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator proposes a new provision which, as I understand, brings the Civil Defense Administrator into the picture.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. The original bill contained an almost identical proposal, but it provided for \$100 million. I am reducing the amount to \$10 million, as a beginning, because I believe surveys must be made.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the main argument in opposition to the Chavez amendment was that it would prevent adequate provision to be made for the defense of the large cities. I said that soon a special bill for that purpose would be introduced. I did not know that it would be introduced so soon, within a few minutes. Unfortunately, Mr. President, I did not attend the meeting, because I had to be somewhere else. However, if we are to bring the Civil Defense Administrator into the picture, some further consideration ought to be given to the subject.

Mr. FERGUSON. The amendment does not expand the existing authority. There is another amendment which I believe should be adopted.

Mr. STENNIS. There will be another amendment offered expanding the present authority of the Civilian Defense Administrator?

Mr. FERGUSON. I plan to offer such an amendment, but that is not the provision of the pending amendment. If the Senator desires me to tell him what I have in mind, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. STENNIS. If the Senator would not mind doing so.

Mr. FERGUSON. The next amendment which I intend to offer reads:

In order to assure that adequate consideration is given to civil defense aspects in the planning and construction of highways constructed or reconstructed with the aid of Federal funds, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to consult—

Only consult—

from time to time, with the Federal Civil Defense Administrator relative to the civil defense aspects of highways so constructed or reconstructed.

Mr. STENNIS. That is for belt highways.

Mr. FERGUSON. Or radial highways.

Mr. STENNIS. Will all the expense be borne by the Federal Government?

Mr. FERGUSON. The way the previous act was drawn, it is within the discretion of the Administrator to pay for it all or to have part of the amount allowed by the cities, and so forth.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from Mississippi will recall the testimony given a few years ago by the then administrator

of public roads, Mr. McDonald, in which he stated that he made the best deal he could with reference to access roads. He would get authority from the State or county or whatever agency might co-operate, but in no case had the Federal Government paid 100 percent, but that in many areas it had paid 75 percent.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for that information.

I feel that this is rather an innovation. Access roads, as I have understood, are for military use and to furnish to military units accessibility to the main highway system. There is now brought forward the matter of accessibility for city populations which is a very important matter, but which I think, should be studied and worked on before it becomes law.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I do not think it is a new policy. The policy was established in the 1952 act.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I wonder if the Senator from Mississippi may not be thinking of the other amendment of the Senator from Michigan. The amendment now pending reads as follows:

For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 10 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 * * * there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of \$10 million, to remain available until expended.

And so forth. It does not broaden the existing authorization. It is simply an additional increment of \$10 million to the existing authorization. The amendment which relates to the Civil Defense Administrator is a separate amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. As I understood, the committee decided to omit this subject matter because it was primarily a military question, or was so intimately connected with the military that we should leave it out of the general highway bill. The subject matter was discussed by the committee on that basis. I wish to co-operate with the Senator from Michigan, but I think his amendment should have more consideration. In great deference, I would oppose it on those grounds.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the pending amendment not only increases the authorization by \$10 million, but it provides that \$50 million of the sums heretofore and herein authorized for the purposes of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, as amended and supplemented, shall be available for contract immediately upon the passage of the act.

That means, Mr. President, that the Appropriations Committee will have no function except a perfunctory one. It means that an agency can enter into a contract immediately after passage of the act, without coming to the Appropriations Committee, and without submitting to the Congress a plan for its approval.

I share the views of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. The committee carefully considered this bill. We think we have brought

to the Senate a good bill, a bill which pays proper regard to the highway needs of the Nation, to the extent, in the opinion of the committee, that the taxpayers would be justifiably called upon to support. But here at the last minute we are asked to provide \$50 million of contract authorization, perhaps entirely Federal. For what good reason can the Senate be called upon at this late hour, without adequate consideration, to agree to this amendment? We have had quite a debate over the question of allocation, as to whether we should follow the traditional formula or give special consideration to population.

Mr. President, I ask the Senate to defeat this amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I think each time Congress has provided funds for access roads, the language of the act has included some contract authorization. It is true that the committee did not include this in the bill, because there were considerable authorizations for which appropriations had not been made. The testimony before the committee, however, developed two very important facts. One was that there is approximately \$14 million worth of certified projects existing today for which money has not been appropriated.

In addition, Mr. Johnson, Director of the Division of Raw Materials of the Atomic Energy Commission, testified at page 292 of the hearings that they have requirements for the fiscal year of approximately \$3,100,000 in uranium mining areas, so that the money which has already been certified, plus the \$3,100,000, would make approximately \$17 million worth of projects which have either been certified or are under consideration. So that approximately \$17 million of the amount the amendment carries for contract authorization would be needed immediately.

The record also developed that most of the money for access-roads appropriations and authorizations previously has been expended upon roads certified by the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. C. D. Curtiss, of the Bureau of Public Roads, stated that in addition to \$5,700,000, there has been added \$22,500,000 certified by the Atomic Energy Commission.

So that up to this time most of the money has gone for access roads to uranium mines or for roads at plants of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I have so much faith in this amendment and so much faith in what it proposes to do, that I feel positive the Senate and the House will appropriate money to do this job through their regular appropriations committees.

I ask to modify my amendment by striking out the colon after the word "expended" and substituting a period, and then striking out the language after the word "expended" down to and including line 9. The language stricken out is as follows:

Provided, That \$50,000,000 of the sums heretofore and herein authorized for the purposes of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 765), as amended and supplemented, shall be available for con-

tract immediately upon the passage of this Act.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I appreciate the concession of the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan. With that modification of his amendment, I shall be glad to support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has modified his amendment.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the companion amendment which with relation to the Federal Civil Defense Administrator brings him in purely in an advisory capacity. I think that is not a change in policy, and I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from Michigan.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment 4-5-54-JJ, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, after line 15, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

CONSULTATION WITH FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATOR

SEC. 8. In order to assure that adequate consideration is given to civil defense aspects in the planning and construction of highways constructed or reconstructed with the aid of Federal funds, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to consult, from time to time, with the Federal Civil Defense Administrator relative to the civil defense aspects of highways so constructed or reconstructed.

Renumber succeeding section numbers.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, certainly I see no objection to the amendment. All it does is to authorize direct consultation. The existing law provides that the President shall designate who shall make certification. I do not believe there is anything wrong in having the Secretary of Commerce consult with the Civil Defense Administrator with respect to the designations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, before we move to the final passage of the bill, may I inquire of the eminent Senator from Pennsylvania, who is, I understand, in charge of the bill, as to what is the theory upon which the bill is based.

Last year, approximately \$650 million in all, was appropriated for roads. The bill now before the Senate carries an authorization which will inevitably result in expenditures of \$1 billion a year, or \$350 million more than the present amount. I wish to ask the eminent Senator from Pennsylvania how this can be reconciled with the desire of the administration for a balanced budget?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, in reply to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, I know that many Senators and many persons in my own State are wondering why I am advocating this greatly increased appropriation. This is the reason:

Last year, after the adjournment of Congress, I, as chairman of the Committee on Public Works, visited various parts of the United States. Together with other members of the Senate and House Committees on Public Works, I had a long conference with the executive committee of the American Association of State Highway Officials. This organization is comprised of the heads of the highway commissions of the various States.

To my mind, we are farther behind in the construction of roads in America than we are in connection with any other projects. We are not appropriating, when the depreciated value of the dollar is considered, any more money now than was appropriated 15 years ago. We have gone through World War II and the Korean war. We have not had the opportunity of keeping up our road building.

More than 3 million passenger cars, buses, and trucks, above the number which are scrapped, go onto the highways every year. To my mind, for the safety of the nation, not only from a traffic standpoint, but also from a defense standpoint, it is absolutely necessary that we begin to construct roads. It was for that reason that I felt the bill should have the support, not only of the Congress of the United States but also of the people of the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the statement of my good friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania, but again I wish to ask how this bill can be reconciled with the claim of the administration that it desires to balance the budget.

The administration, in the budget which it sent to Congress in January, said that the deficit for the current fiscal year would be \$3.3 billion; and that for fiscal 1954-55, it would be \$2.9 billion. We know, as an actual fact, that the deficits will in fact be much greater, irrespective of any tax reduction, because of a shrinkage in revenue. Now the Senator from Pennsylvania is proposing to increase appropriations by \$350 million, which will increase the deficit still further.

Again, I wish to ask my good friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania, what has become of the desire of the Republican Party to balance the budget?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I, of course, shall be glad to hold the Senate in session for a discussion of the general fiscal policies of the Government of the United States. But the hour is almost 6 o'clock, and I had hoped that we might dispose of the bill. This is an authorization bill. I assume that full debate could be had when the bill to provide appropriations comes before the Senate.

The distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] had a relatively noncontroversial bill which he was anxious to have called up this afternoon.

I do not wish to move to recess the Senate at this time without having disposed of the highway bill. I was hopeful that it might be brought to final passage, since it had bipartisan sponsorship and, as I understand, even the unanimous support of the Committee on Public Works and substantial support on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the statement of my good friend, the Senator from California. I assure him it is not my intention to delay matters. But I am certain he does not wish to deprive the country of the information which we are eagerly awaiting from the Senator from Pennsylvania, namely, how the additional expenditure—because it will be an expenditure—of \$350 million a year can be reconciled with the desire of the administration to have a balanced budget. I am still eagerly awaiting those words from the Senator from Pennsylvania; and if he can briefly explain the matter, it will close up the whole matter.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I apologize for taking so much time, but I may say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that for 50 years I have advocated large expenditures for national defense. I have now come to the conclusion, after a great deal of study and consideration, that the expenditure proposed by this bill can be made up many times by cutting down on appropriations for national defense and foreign aid. I shall be fighting for that principle.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it possible that economic conditions played any part in the decision of the distinguished leader of the majority in connection with the bill to increase expenditures for road building? Is this a form of compensatory governmental action to offset an economic contraction?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the answer is "No."

Mr. KNOWLAND. I assume that the extension of the gasoline tax, plus the fact that better roads, I think, will make it more likely that a greater number of automobiles will use the highways, which will tend to increase the revenues of the Government, are also factors.

I shall be glad to discuss the matter more fully at another time; but again, I respectfully suggest that we might conclude our action on the proposed legislation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does not the fact that the committee included in the bill a provision giving the President, in the event of an economic recession which might grow worse, authority to step up the provisions of the bill by a year, and to put into play a very much enlarged public-works program, not on a make-work basis, but on the basis of doing something to care for the Nation's needs, add to the advantage of the bill from a standpoint which has been previously suggested by the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think there are many valid reasons for the passage of the bill.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois will give me his attention for a moment, I should like to suggest, in answer to his question, that the bill does not relate to the 1955 budget. It provides an authorization for expenditure in the fiscal year 1955-56, for which no budget has been received.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The issue has been made clear, again and again, on the Senate floor that this type of bill so far as roads are concerned is, to all intents and purposes, an appropriation bill. Once the authorization for roads is made, the money is then allocated to the several States. It has been held by this body, again and again, that Congress is then bound to appropriate funds up to the amount of the authorization. I have opposed this conclusion but I have been repeatedly and overwhelmingly defeated. Therefore, when this bill is approved, automatically the expenditures will follow.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator knows this has nothing to do with the budget for the fiscal year ending 1955.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. I may suggest to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that if one were to review the \$10 billion a year which the Senator has been voting for since the junior Senator from Nevada has been a Member of the Senate, to build roads and projects in European countries, we might have balanced the budget if some of that money had been used to build a few roads in the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have heard the Senator from Nevada make that statement many times, but at the moment the Senate has before it the highway bill; and I am struck by the position of the majority when, on the one hand, it says it wishes to balance the budget, and, on the other hand, advocates expending \$350 million more on highways than was spent last year or \$700 million more in the 2 years. I do not see how such positions can be reconciled, unless the majority admits that there is a need for a public works program to offset an economic recession. If that is the purpose of the bill, I shall support it.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. A very direct answer can be given to the Senator from Illinois. The President, in his message to the Congress, suggested that the Congress should make increased provision for the construction of public roads provided the gasoline taxes were extended. It has been stated repeatedly during the debate of the last few days that the amount proposed to be appropriated by the highway bill is substantially the equivalent of the anticipated receipts from the Federal gasoline tax during fiscal years 1956 and 1957, for which this bill provides. The receipts from the Federal gasoline tax for the fiscal year 1953 were \$979 million. Such tax receipts are increasing at the

rate of about 5 percent a year. That will mean that the billion-dollar mark will be passed during fiscal years 1956 and 1957. So that it is consistent with the program announced by the administration that there should be a highway program which would cost substantially the equivalent of receipts from the Federal tax on gasoline and lubricating oils.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works be discharged from further consideration of H. R. 8127, which is the House bill on this subject. If the unanimous consent request is granted by the Senate, I shall then ask, as is customary in our legislative procedure, that all after the enacting clause be stricken from the House bill and that the Senate bill, as amended, be substituted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I may say, in reply to the comment of the Senator from South Dakota, that passage of the bill will lead to an increase in Federal expenditures. It may be true that there will be expended in Federal aid for highways only the approximate sum to be collected in Federal gas taxes; but it is well known that in the past there has been collected more money from the Federal gas tax than has been spent on Federal highways and on Federal aid to highways, and that the difference has been used for other purposes. Furthermore, the Federal gas tax is not an allocated or pledged tax; it is instead merged with the general revenues, and from those general revenues, appropriations are made. So that this hocus pocus, if I may call it that, which my good friend the Senator from South Dakota is indulging in, does not fool anybody. What is happening is that the administration or the Republican Party is increasing expenditures for the years 1956 and 1957 by \$350 million over those now provided, and that will increase the Federal deficit by this amount. If it is desired to do all this in order to stabilize economic conditions, well and good; but Senators might as well admit what is being done.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I hope the distinguished Senator from Illinois will not be too disappointed if there is not an economic dislocation. He seems to be devoting a great deal of his time to it.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois appears to be pretty well mixed up. We must have better transportation facilities in order to take care of the expanded economy which we expect to enjoy during the next few years.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I renew my request that the Committee on Public Works be discharged from further consideration of H. R. 8127.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 8127.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill

(H. R. 8127), to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended, and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I now move that all after the enacting clause of the House be stricken, and that Senate bill 3184, as amended, be inserted in lieu thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the final passage of the bill. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" seem to have it. The "ayes" have it, and the bill is passed.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MARTIN, Mr. CASE, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CHAVEZ, and Mr. HOLLAND conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 3184, to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, is indefinitely postponed.

CONVEYANCE OF PROPERTY TO BOULDER, COLO.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1089, Senate bill 2713.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2713) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to reconvey certain property which the city of Boulder, Colo., donated to the Secretary of Commerce for the establishment of a radio propagation laboratory.

Mr. KNOWLAND. For the information of the Senate, since it is now a little after 6 o'clock, I may say I do not intend to proceed to the consideration of the bill this afternoon. There are a number of Senators who have matters which they desire to have considered. There is one bill which the distinguished Senator from South Carolina desires to have considered, and, I now ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside in order to consider Calendar No. 1180, H. R. 839.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SCARLETT SCOGGIN

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1180, H. R. 889.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 889) for the relief of Scarlett Scoggin.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to have this bill taken up out of order, even though it will be noted that on the calendar there are several similar bills which normally would come up on the call of the calendar and probably would be passed without debate.

However, my attention has been called to the fact that the Rev. and Mrs. Blainard Elmo Scoggin, the adoptive parents of Scarlett Scoggin, are citizens of the United States, and the Reverend Scoggin is a missionary in Palestine for the Southern Baptist Convention. Reverend and Mrs. Scoggin are arranging to return home on the 29th of this month, and they wish to bring the child with them. That is the purpose and effect of the bill.

So, Mr. President, I ask for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 889) for the relief of Scarlett Scoggin was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS OF STATE DEPARTMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 365)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEALL in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State on the operations of the Department of State under section 2 of Public Law 584, 79th Congress, as required by that law.

The enclosed report contains a summary of developments under the program during the 1953 calendar year. It also includes a status report on executive agreements concluded with foreign governments pursuant to this legislation, as well as listings of names of both American and foreign recipients of grants, a detailed statement on expenditures, various statistical tables, and other information concerning the operations of this program during the 1953 calendar year.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 7, 1954.

(Enclosure: Report from the Secretary of State concerning Public Law 584.)

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR DEPARTMENT OF LABOR—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, there is at the desk the conference report on House Joint Resolution 461, making an additional appropriation for the Department of Labor. I understand that the Senator from Michigan [Mr.

FERGUSON] is prepared to submit the conference report at this time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 461) making an additional appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 461) making an additional appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 1.

STYLES BRIDGES,
HOMER FERGUSON,
GUY CORDON,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

FRED E. BUSHEY,
HAMER H. BUDGE,
JOHN TABER,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the calling up of the conference report on House Joint Resolution 461 be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Upton in the chair). Without objection it is so ordered.

LICENSE TO LEAHI HOSPITAL TO USE CERTAIN UNITED STATES PROPERTY IN HONOLULU, HAWAII

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of the conference report on House bill 6025, dealing with the Leahi Hospital, at Honolulu. Prior announcement has been given that the conference report would be taken up today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6025) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to grant a license to the Leahi Hospital, a nonprofit institu-

tion, to use certain United States property in the city and county of Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, as the Senate will recall, the bill passed the Senate with an amendment, which was offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], providing that the hospital should pay 50 percent of the fair rental value of the land which was leased under a 10-year lease by the Federal Government to the hospital, for parking purposes. In conference the House conferees refused to agree to the amendment, and there was nothing for the Senate conferees to do but recede, or else have the bill die in conference.

The Senate conferees did recede; and the conference report is now before the Senate without the amendment which was submitted by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, I have been rather consistent in supporting the Morse amendment to many bills. I think it has great merit, and I think it has helped in many ways. But, for the life of me, Mr. President, I cannot see how the Morse amendment applies in this case.

Here we are dealing with a 10-year lease, involving about 4½ acres of ground which the Government does not need at this time. The lease is a revocable one, Mr. President. It amounts to only a tenancy by sufferance. The minute the Government wants to take the land back, under the terms of the lease it can retake and regain complete possession and control of the land.

The hospital expects to spend about \$20,000 improving this land, so that when the Government does get it back it will be in an improved state and will be of greater value than it is today. I think it is quite unfair to ask an institution such as a hospital, which is supported largely by public funds, to use such public funds to pay rental to the Federal Government. It means that the Federal Government is, in effect, taking money out of one pocket and putting it into another.

I hope the Senator from Oregon will not oppose this conference report. I feel in my heart that this is not the sort of case to which the Morse formula should be applied. Again and again on the floor of the Senate I have objected to the consideration of bills because they did not comply with the Morse formula. Here we are dealing with a lease. Title will remain at all times in the Federal Government. It will get the land back with improvements. As I say, some \$20,000 will be expended on the land.

I hope the Senator from Oregon will see the difference between this case and a case in which something of real and permanent value is being transferred.

Mr. DANIEL obtained the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Texas would mind permitting us to see if we can complete action on the conference report. I am hopeful that that may be done in a few minutes. I assure the Senator that there will be no move to recess until he has had the

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued April 9, 1954
For actions of April 8, 1954
83rd-2nd, No. 65

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....10	Fisheries.....14	Prices, support...3,4,12,16
Appropriations.....1,9	Flood control.....8	Reclamation.....17
Buildings.....2	Labor, farm.....1	Reorganization.....18
Dairy industry.....4,12,16	Marketing.....15	Research.....20
Education.....11	Meat consumption.....19	Road authorizations.....7
Fees and charges.....5	Personnel.....6,13	Wool.....3,4

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate completed congressional action on Mexican farm-labor appropriation measure. Senate debated buildings lease-purchase bill. House sent road authorizations bill to conference. Agricultural appropriation bill is to be reported today, and debate is to begin Mon. Senate debate on wool bill is to begin Mon. Rep. Stringfellow defended reorganization of PMA committees.

SENATE

1. FARM LABOR. Agreed to the conference report on H. J. Res. 461, providing an appropriation of \$478,000 additional to the Labor Department for the Mexican farm labor program (pp. 4579-80). This measure will now be sent to the President.
2. BUILDINGS. Began debate on H. R. 6342, to authorize the General Services Administration to acquire land and to provide for construction of buildings thereon by executing lease-purchase contracts. Agreed to the committee amendments. Sen. Dirksen objected to one of these amendments, which would require approval of the Public Works Committees to the larger contracts. He inserted an opinion of the Justice Department that this provision was unconstitutional. He submitted an amendment that would provide for a waiting period, in order to give Congress an opportunity to consider the contracts, but would not authorize congressional committees to prevent the contracts from going into effect. (pp. 4586, 4591-610.)
3. WOOL PRICE SUPPORTS. Sen. Hendrickson announced that it is expected the wool bill, S. 2911, will be debated beginning Monday (p. 4611).
4. PRICE SUPPORTS. Sen. Langer inserted farm-groups' requests regarding price supports on dairy products, wool, beef, poultry, eggs, etc. (pp. 4576-7). Sen. Aiken inserted a Vt. Poultry Assn. resolution saying price supports are "superficial" and that "fundamental faults" should be attacked (p. 4576).
5. INSPECTION FEES. Sen. Langer inserted a Potato Growers Assn. resolution opposing an increase in terminal-market inspection fees for USDA (p. 4576).

HOUSE

6. PERSONNEL. As reported (see Digest 63), S. 2665 provides as follows: Abolishes the crafts, protective, and custodial schedule of the Classification Act and transfers these positions to either the local prevailing-wage-rate system or the general schedule. Increases from 400 to 700 the number of authorized super-grades and removes the limitation on the number of positions in each grade. Provides for longevity salary step increases for employees at GS-11 through GS-15. Authorizes departments to request appropriations to pay not over \$100 annually for employee-uniform allowances. Repeals the Whitten amendment.

Modernizes and simplifies the overtime and premium compensation laws relating to Federal employees. Raises the cut-off point on overtime pay to the maximum of GS-9, now \$5,810. Increases the ceiling on base pay plus overtime or any other premium pay from \$10,330 to \$11,800. Guarantees a minimum of 2 hours' pay at the overtime rate for any Federal employee called back for overtime work on a non-work-day or during his off-duty hours. Assures employees that they will be assigned to normal work schedules except where irregular tours of duty are essential and permits agencies to continue to schedule unusual tours of duty for employees whenever operating requirements necessitate it. Permits a department to pay not in excess of 25% of an employee's basic pay if the employee occupies a position such as fire fighter which requires him to remain at his station longer than ordinary periods of duty, with a substantial part of the work consisting of remaining in a standby status (such premium pay to be in lieu of other premium pay provided for under the bill). Provides for similar benefits up to 15% additional to base pay, for irregular or unscheduled overtime, night, or holiday duty, to other employees (such as criminal investigators) whose hours of duty cannot be controlled administratively and which require substantial amounts of irregular unscheduled overtime duty or at night and on holidays.

Establishes a uniform Government employees' incentive awards program. Places authority for direction of the program with the Civil Service Commission. Authorizes Presidential honorary awards to civilian employees. Authorizes monetary awards based on Government-wide savings when appropriate. Makes employees under all pay laws eligible for all types of awards. Eliminates salary-increase awards and provides for cash awards in their stead. Eliminates the present \$25,000 annual limit on total cash awards an agency can make for adopted employee suggestions. Eliminates the present \$1,000 limit on individual cash awards for employee suggestions. Eliminates the present maximum (an amount equal to three within-grade salary steps) on certain cash awards. Extends the awards program to cover inventions by Government employees. Permits delegation, within departments, of the authority to make awards.

7. ROAD AUTHORIZATIONS. House conferees were appointed on H. R. 8127, to authorize road appropriations for 1956-7 (p. 4638). Senate conferees have been appointed.
8. FLOOD CONTROL. The Public Works Committee reported without amendment H. R. 8377, authorizing appropriations for Army flood-control projects in the Columbia Basin (H. Rept. 1509)(p. 4645).
9. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955. The Appropriations Committee was granted permission to report this bill today, Apr. 9, during House adjournment. Majority Leader Hallock stated that, if a rule is reported, this bill will be considered Mon. and, if not completed that day, will go over until Wed. because of the Ill. primary (p. 4637).
10. ADJOURNED until Mon., Apr. 12 (p. 4645).

I think we have gone pretty far in this matter when one reflects in 1941, just prior to World War II—and while a war was waging in Europe—there was a proposal made to legalize wiretapping. I can remember that I opposed it then as did the majority of the Members of Congress at that time. As a result, the measure did not pass. A very unique strategy was used today to promote the present bill and that was the majority leadership tagged the measure as an antitraitor bill. This undoubtedly got many votes for the measure because I know many Members who voted for the bill did so because their constituents would not understand a vote against it. But people should remember that their telephones can be tapped at any time if this bill becomes a law. In other words, it is nothing except eavesdropping. If the Attorney General and the FBI are not capable of ferreting out traitors and subversives in this country without the aid of wiretapping, then I think it is high time to hire new men to do their job. The fact that the courts will determine the admissibility does not make it less obnoxious and dangerous.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6025) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to grant a license to the Leahi Hospital, a nonprofit institution, to use certain United States property in the city and county of Honolulu, T. H."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 461) entitled "Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1954, and for other purposes."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE WEEK AND NEXT WEEK

(Mr. RAYBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RAYBURN. I do this, Mr. Speaker, in order to ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] what we may expect for the remainder of the week and for next week.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I might say to the gentleman that there is an understanding about a matter which will be taken up immediately following this.

Then we expect to take up the bill that was scheduled having to do with the impounding of mail in certain circumstances immediately following and conclude that this evening.

If that is concluded I shall ask unanimous consent to adjourn over until Monday.

We expect to get the Agricultural appropriation bill and report filed tomorrow. A rule will be necessary in connection with it. If the rule is filed we will call the Agriculture appropriation bill Monday.

Monday, of course, is District day, and I understand there are some bills from the Committee on the District of Columbia that may be called on Monday. They are S. 2305, the safety-responsibility bill; H. R. 7061 having to do with the adoption of children; and H. R. 7062, having to do with the placing of children.

Following the District business we will call up the Agriculture appropriation bill. There is a difference of opinion as to how rapidly that bill can be disposed of, but it will be the continuing order of business for such time as may be necessary.

The Illinois primary takes place on Tuesday, and under our arrangement the gentleman knows we would undertake to keep that day clear. There are other considerations that interest some other Members; but if the Agriculture appropriation bill is not concluded on Monday it will go over and be concluded on Wednesday.

Wednesday is Pan-American Day and some time will be taken up on that.

There were two bills that were scheduled for this week which will go over to the latter part of next week: H. R. 2556 having to do with the extradition of certain fugitives and S. 984 having to do with the tax court decisions.

Mr. RAYBURN. Let me say to the gentleman that a great many Members are not going to be here next week. He knows that and I know that. There has been some question raised about the bill H. R. 2556. It is my understanding that that bill will be controversial. I do not know, however.

Mr. HALLECK. I may say to the gentleman from Texas that we never undertook to clear the program for next week. I appreciate the suggestion of the gentleman. If that matter could be disposed of on Wednesday, which would seem quite likely, I would hope it could be done, but, as the gentleman knows, we expect to take a recess for the following week and of necessity some of these matters that are before us must be disposed of. I really think we have been rather liberal.

Mr. RAYBURN. Are we going to legislate on Thursday or Friday of next week?

Mr. HALLECK. We are not going to legislate on Friday.

Mr. RAYBURN. On Thursday?

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman knows what our understanding has been about the Easter recess. We expect to recess from Thursday evening before Good Friday, the evening of the 15th, until Monday the 26.

Mr. RAYBURN. Hoping that nothing controversial will come up.

Mr. HALLECK. As the gentleman knows I have been accommodating, and will be.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on Rules may have until midnight tomorrow night to file reports on the bill H. R. 8377, introduced by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL], and on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for 1955.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for 1955.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN reserved all points of order on the Department of Agriculture bill.

FUNDS FOR HOSPITALIZATION OF CERTAIN VETERANS IN THE PHILIPPINES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 8044) to extend the authorization for funds for the hospitalization of certain veterans in the Philippines.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of Public Law 865, 80th Congress, is hereby amended by deleting the word "five" and substituting therefore the word "eight."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the word "eight" and insert the word "ten."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

House Resolution 503 was laid on the table.

THE MEANING OF BATAAN

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is particularly fitting on this day that the Nation pay tribute to those gallant American and Philippine soldiers who fought so courageously against vastly superior totalitarian forces on the peninsula of Bataan. The beleaguered American-Philippine forces for 3 long months, outnumbered, underequipped, lacking in munitions and other implements of war, harassed by disease and exhaustion, fought on against heavy odds and with courage and fortitude, bitterly contested every inch of the ground of Bataan. Such a sacrifice was necessary in order to give the democracies sufficient time to consolidate their forces in the United States, Australia, and elsewhere.

The heroes of Bataan had accomplished their mission and to them must go a major part of the credit for the ultimate victory in 1945. The sacrifice at Bataan wrecked the timetable of the Japanese forces for more than 3 months, which but for it would have been sufficient time for the Japanese to overrun the rest of southeast Asia, the Pacific, and Australia. It was a dark day in the course of our struggle in the Pacific when Bataan fell. But during the last 12 years the word "Bataan" has become a word of honor and courage in our language and in the language of freedom the world over. Yes, Bataan was a military defeat but it was a victory of spirit—the spirit which moves men regardless of color or creed to unite in a common cause and fight to retain their freedom.

Mr. Speaker, Bataan should never have been and the blood that was shed and the treasures that were wasted then would not have been in vain if we had not allowed ourselves to be lulled into a false sense of security. We were engrossed in the pleasures that flow from our democratic way of life, never realizing that the liberties which we enjoy are ours only if we exercise the greatest of vigilance.

We saw that phenomenon in the period between the First and Second World Wars. It took the tragedy of Pearl Harbor and the bombing of Manila to jar us from our lethargy. It was then too late to win the initial victory of the war. We saw that phenomenon again after Second World War and so came Korea. In it we saw a repetition of the tragedies that overtook us in 1941.

Mr. Speaker, it is the responsibility of the Congress to see that this does not happen again. Because today in this atomic and thermonuclear age we face a threat not only to our liberties but to our survival as a Nation, never before experienced in our history. The godless masters of the Kremlin in their quest for world domination respect only military strength and therefore our best hope of preventing a third world war, and to win it if it comes, is to maintain a strong Military Establishment. That is why Bataan should be a constant reminder to all of us that we must be prepared for any eventuality by fostering and maintaining a strong Army, an effective Navy and Air Force, backed up by a strong and free economy. Bataan should also stand as a constant reminder of the need for strong allies to work with this Nation in maintaining a collective security for the free world. Our country's contribution to NATO, the Pacific pacts, and other security arrangements gives proof to the fact that the United States is increasingly aware of the need for collective security. We must continue to support these endeavors.

I should like to quote General Wainwright, the hero of Bataan:

My men and I were victims of shortsightedness at home, of blind trust in the respectability of scheming aggressors. * * * The price of our unpreparedness * * * was staggering to the imagination. The price of our unpreparedness for a world war III would be death to millions of us and the disappearance from the earth of its greatest Nation.

Mr. Speaker, it is particularly fitting that the bill H. R. 8044, to continue Philippine hospitalization, should be considered today.

This bill, which was reported unanimously from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, extends for 5 additional years the authority of the American Government to bear a portion of the expense incident to the hospitalization of veterans of the Republic of the Philippines who fought in defense of the United States during World War II.

Public Law 865 of the 80th Congress enacted July 1, 1948, and the authority for the hospitalization feature expires December 31 of this year.

Over 50,000 Filipinos died on Bataan, Mr. Speaker, and it is appropriate today, which is the anniversary of the fall of Bataan, that we do honor to those men and to the others who survived, by extending the right of hospitalization for an additional period.

The original law also provided a grant of \$22.5 million for the construction of a hospital which is now scheduled for completion next year. The original act also provided for the United States Government to pay \$3,285,000 each year for hospitalization and in no year since that law was enacted has the maximum figure been reached. The first year it was over \$30,000; the second year \$352,000; the third year \$1,100,000; and in 1953 \$2,164,000.

At the present time hospitalization is being furnished by some 20 private and 5 Government hospitals most of which have contracts with the Philippine Veterans' Board. These contracts provide for the hospitals to furnish all required medicine, food, lodging, and so forth, at a flat per diem rate. These rates vary from \$10 to \$16.50 per day, depending upon the type of patients, medical facilities available, and other factors. All of the patients are service-connected and, at the end of January 1954, 686 patients were being taken care of. Approximately 50 percent of the patients hospitalized are tubercular. This is a reflection of the high incidence of TB in the Philippines, plus the fact that many of these veterans suffered from malnutrition, inadequate clothing, and shelter during the period of the Japanese occupation.

I believe that this legislation is entirely warranted, it is supported by the Veterans' Administration and the Department of State, and it has the recommendation of the national commander of the American Legion, based on his personal inspection of the islands.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I am so happy to have the gentlewoman from Massachusetts bring up the subject of Bataan before the Congress and to remind us of the noble sacrifices that were made there, something that must always be engraved on our hearts, something which we must remember every day and every year.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentlewoman from New York

and may I say to her that, of course, today we commemorate the fall of Bataan, but it really amounted to a victory.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I realize that and I think we should remember it more often even than on this great anniversary.

FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 8127) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]? (After a pause.) The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. DONDERO, ANGELL, MCGREGOR, FALLON, and DAVIS of Tennessee.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I have for Tuesday be transferred to Wednesday of next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House on Monday next for 45 minutes following any special orders heretofore entered.

REVISION OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, several years' experience under the Taft-Hartley Act has apparently convinced the members and the officials of local unions, as distinguished from the officers of the internationals, that it is not only a workable law, a much-needed law, but of great help and protection to local union officials and employees who are members of unions. It gives the latter protection not only against unfair practices by employers, but it gives them at least a partial protection, a protection which they did not have under the Wagner law, against practices by their own officers which are arbitrary and unfair.

Several harmful absurdities still exist in connection with our economic practices and life.

For example, because the Federal law has, in some aspects, dealt with labor disputes, State courts have been deprived of the right, through injunction, to protect the property of the individual, his right to work. That is an evil which should be corrected by the relinquishment of the Federal Government of the practice of interfering with the States, the courts of the States, in their efforts to protect personal and property rights of its citizens.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued April 12, 1954,
For actions of April 9, 1954
33rd-2nd, No. 66

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....10	Extension work.....17	Prices, support.....3
Agricultural	Fees and charges.....7	Reclamation.....16
appropriation.....1	Foreign aid.....5	Research.....17
Appropriations.....9,17	Forests and forestry....14	Road authorizations.....6
Banking and currency....8	Irrigation.....11	Sugar.....18
Buildings.....2	Lands, reclamation.....16	Surplus commodities...4,12
Credit unions.....13	Legislative program.....10	Wheat.....12
Dairy industry.....4,15	Loans, farm.....11	Wool.....3

HIGHLIGHTS: House committee reported agricultural appropriation bill, and Rules Committee cleared it. Senate debated buildings lease-purchase bill. Sen. Anderson introduced and discussed bill for irrigation-well loans.

HOUSE

1. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955. The Appropriations Committee reported without amendment this bill, H. R. 8779, and the Rules Committee reported a resolution for its consideration without points of order. (p. D398). Debate on the bill is to begin today, following consideration of D. C. bills. The "Daily Digest" states that "if a record vote is demanded on its passage on Tuesday then the vote will be deferred until Wednesday, as Tuesday is primary day in Illinois (p. D400).

Representatives of the Department agencies have been advised in detail of the Committee's actions on the estimates for the Department. Copies of the bill committee report, and hearings will be distributed directly to the agency budget offices, as soon as received, pursuant to a distribution list that has been worked out with the Department agencies. The agencies will receive the material at the same time this office will receive it. The material will not be distributed from this office. In general, copies should be obtained from the agency budget offices rather than from this office.

At the end of this Digest is a summary comparison of the Committee actions with the 1955 estimates and with total anticipated funds available in 1954, and excerpts from the committee report.

SENATE

1. BUILDINGS. Continued debate on H. R. 6342, to authorize GSA to provide for private construction of buildings with lease agreements providing for gradual purchase of the buildings by the Government. Rejected, 8 to 60, a Dirksen amendment providing for a waiting period before effectuation of the larger contracts, in lieu of the committee recommendation for agreement with the Public Works Committees on such contracts. (pp. 4664-77.)

1. WOOL PRICE SUPPORTS. Sen. Anderson inserted his legislative report of 1946 favoring a bill to authorize direct payments in connection with wool supports (pp. 4683-4).

4. DAIRY INDUSTRY. Sen. Humphrey inserted a Wholesale Grocers' Assn. letter favoring S. 3079, his bill to distribute surplus dairy products to the needy (pp. 4648-9).
5. FOREIGN AID. The Foreign Relations Committee reported with amendments S. Res. 214, providing for a study of technical-assistance programs (S.Rept. 1198, p. 4649).
6. ROAD AUTHORIZATIONS. A substitute conferee was appointed on H. R. 8127, the road-authorizations bill (p. 4651).
7. FEES AND CHARGES. Sen. Bricker inserted the resolution of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee recommending postponement of the Budget Circular on fees and charges and inserted the Circular (pp. 4651-2).
8. BANKING AND CURRENCY. Sen. Humphrey charged "tight credit and hard money" and said this policy has injured farmers and others (pp. 4654-64).
9. THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954. The Appropriations Committee completed hearings on this bill, H. R. 8481, and is to mark it up Apr. 13 (p. D396).
10. RECESSED until Mon., Apr. 12 (p. 4694). Legislative program, as announced by Sen. Knowland: Lease-purchase, wool supports, Carlson personnel bill, Sugar Agreement; no session Tues. or Fri. (pp. 4676-7).

BILLS INTRODUCED

11. FARM LOANS. S. 3289, by Sen. Anderson, to authorize USDA to insure loans for irrigation wells; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Remarks of author. (pp. 4649-51.)
12. WHEAT. S. 3285, by Sen. Neely, to donate price-support wheat to the needy; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 4649).
13. CREDIT UNIONS. H. R. 8724, by Rep. Pelly (introduced Apr. 6), to require bonding of personnel of Federal credit unions; to Banking and Currency Committee.
14. SABOTAGE. H. R. 8749, by Rep. Poff (introduced Apr. 7), to amend the anti-sabotage law so as to include forage, forest products, standing timber, and water and to make it applicable to times of emergency as well as during war.

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

15. DAIRY INDUSTRY. Sen. Lehman inserted a Dairymen's League News (N. Y.) article discussing some of the problems of milk production (pp. A2735-6).
16. RECLAMATION. Sen. Morse inserted G. H. Robinson's speech favoring the Hells Canyon project (pp. A2737-8).
Extension of remarks of Rep. Metcalf favoring Libby Dam (pp. A2740-1).
Sen. Morse inserted a Jordan Farm Bureau Center resolution urging appropriations for continued development of Hells Canyon (p. A2743).
17. APPROPRIATIONS. Rep. Teague inserted M. T. Harrington's (Texas A&M) explanation of the proposed use of research and extension appropriations (p. A2742).

COMMITTEE HEARINGS RELEASED BY GPO

18. SUGAR. Executive B, International Sugar Agreement. S. Foreign Relations Com.

COMMITTEE HEARING ANNOUNCEMENTS FOR APR. 12: Price supports, S. and H. Agriculture. USDA appropriations for 1955, S. Appropriations.

For supplemental information and copies of legislative material referred to, call Ext. 4654 or send to Rm. 105A.

the collection of any such loan, and (4) to do all things necessary for the proper and efficient maintenance and operation of any such property while in his control. Any sum realized by the Secretary in the liquidation of any claim assigned to him which is in excess of the amount of the insurance paid by him in connection with such claim but not in excess of the amount of the uninsured loss sustained by the bank or trust company which made the loan resulting in such claim shall be paid to such bank or trust company.

SEC. 5. Any contract by the Secretary to insure a loan under this section shall be conclusive evidence of the eligibility of such loan for such insurance, and the validity of any such contract of insurance shall be incontestible, except for fraud or misrepresentation on the part of the bank or trust company with which such contract was made.

SEC. 6. The Secretary, in administering the provisions of this act, shall utilize the officers, employees, and facilities of agencies within the Department of Agriculture whose functions are similar to the functions authorized under such provisions, and may allot to such agencies any funds available for carrying out such provisions.

SEC. 7. (a) There is created a fund, to be known as the farm irrigation loan insurance fund, which shall be used by the Secretary as a revolving fund for carrying out the provisions of this act. There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary the sum of \$25 million to constitute such fund.

(b) Moneys in the Fund not needed for current operations shall be deposited with the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the fund or invested in direct obligations of the United States or obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States.

(c) The Secretary shall include in his annual report a complete statement with respect to the status of the fund.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 569. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to impound mail in certain cases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 8044. An act to extend the authorization for funds for the hospitalization of certain veterans in the Philippines; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

CONSTRUCTION OF HIGHWAYS— CHANGE OF CONFeree

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, because of the absence from the city for a few days of the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and at his request, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] may be substituted as a conferee on the bill (H. R. 8127) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, and so forth, were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. KILGORE:

Three articles published in the Miami (Fla.) Herald on March 13, 1954, March 22, 1954, and March 25, 1954, respectively, with reference to Carlos Prio Socarras, the exiled President of Cuba.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Editorial dealing with the outlook for the milk industry, published in the Dairymen's League News of March 30, 1954.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

Article entitled "International Set," written by Jerry Greene, and published in the magazine Pegasus for March 1954, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.

By Mr. WILEY:

Excerpts from booklet entitled "Facts About Great Lakes Shipping."

By Mr. HOEY:

Poem entitled "Jesus Christ the Man," written by James H. Hensley, Jr., of Asheville, N. C.

By Mr. MORSE:

Speech delivered by Gerald H. Robinson, Portland, Oreg., attorney, with reference to Hells Canyon and regional development.

Article on current business trends in Oregon, published in the Oregon Business Review for March 1954.

Resolution from Deschutes County Pomona Grange No. 25, Bend, Oreg., with reference to parcel-post rates.

Resolution of Jordan Farm Bureau Center with reference to Hells Canyon Dam.

LICENSE FEES OR CHARGES BY GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a copy of a resolution unanimously approved March 30 by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, expressing the sense of the committee that the departments and agencies under its legislative jurisdiction should postpone until July 1, 1955, any pending plans or proceedings to impose license fees or charges.

The pending proposals of various agencies to levy fees for licenses issued and similar charges for other services rendered was given impetus by reason of language included in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1952—title V. Thereafter, on November 5, 1953, the Bureau of the Budget, using the language contained in the appropriation bill as its authority, directed the various agencies to establish a schedule of fees "which, taking account of the value to the recipient and the public policy or interest served, shall recover, to the full extent possible, the aggregate cost incurred in the conduct of these activities."

Mr. President, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is not hostile to the idea of assessing fees and charges; in fact, I think it favors it almost unanimously. But committee members are of the unanimous opinion that such a proposal raises basic ques-

tions with regard to the fundamental philosophy of regulations. The committee feels that the Congress should set up the basic standards for each agency to follow in imposing charges for licenses.

I ask that there be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the language of title V of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1952, together with a copy of the Bureau of the Budget directive of November 5, 1953.

There being no objection, the resolution and other matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution approved unanimously by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee:

The Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has taken cognizance of the proposed rule making with regard to license fees or charges and other related activities of various departments, agencies, bureaus, boards, commissions and services of the Government, which execute laws the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of this committee, and after conducting a preliminary inquiry into the subject matter, has concluded that the proposed for various license fees or charges raises basic questions with regard to the fundamental philosophy of regulation under the pertinent laws, and that any departure from the existing structure of licensing by these agencies should be resolved specifically by the Congress after the conclusion of our present inquiry: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee that the Department of Commerce and any agency, commission, or bureau thereof; the Civil Aeronautics Board; the Coast Guard; the Federal Trade Commission; the Federal Power Commission; and the Interstate Commerce Commission, respectively, should suspend until July 1, 1955, any pending or proposed proceeding involving the imposition of fees and charges pursuant to title V of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952 (5 U. S. C. 140), or Circular No. A-25 of the Bureau of the Budget, dated November 5, 1953.

TITLE V—FEES AND CHARGES

It is the sense of the Congress that any work, service, publication, report, document, benefit, privilege, authority, use, franchise, license, permit, certificate, registration, or similar thing of value or utility performed, furnished, provided, granted, prepared, or issued by any Federal agency (including wholly owned Government corporations as defined in the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945) to or for any person (including groups, associations, organizations, partnerships, corporations, or businesses), except those engaged in the transaction of official business of the Government, shall be self-sustaining to the fullest extent possible, and the head of each Federal agency is authorized by regulation (which, in the case of agencies in the executive branch, shall be as uniform as practicable and subject to such policies as the President may prescribe) to prescribe therefor such fee, charge, or price, if any, as he shall determine, in case none exists, or redetermine, in case of an existing one, to be fair and equitable taking into consideration direct and indirect cost to the Government, value to the recipient, public policy or interest served, and other pertinent facts, and any amount so determined or redetermined shall be collected and paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Pro-*

vided, That nothing contained in this title shall repeal or modify existing statutes prohibiting the collection, fixing the amount, or directing the disposition of any fee, charge or price: *Provided further*, That nothing contained in this title shall repeal or modify existing statutes prescribing bases for calculation of any fee, charge or price, but this proviso shall not restrict the redetermination or recalculation in accordance with the prescribed bases of the amount of any such fee, charge or price.

CIRCULAR NO. A-25

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,

Washington D. C., November 5, 1953.

To the heads of executive departments and establishments.

Subject: Fees for licensing, registration, and related activities.

1. Purpose: This circular establishes general policies under title V of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952 (5 U. S. C. 140), for the charging of fees for licensing, registration, and related activities of Federal agencies.

2. Coverage: This circular covers the processing of applications for, and the issuance, renewal, modification, transfer, or termination of, any license, permit, certificate, charter, registration, exemption, or similar form of authorization granted or otherwise provided by Federal agencies. The terms "licensing" and "licensing activities" as used in this circular cover all of the above activities. An equally broad meaning applies to license and licensee as used herein.

This circular does not cover either permits for the use of Government property (such as grazing permits or timber-cutting permits) or any activities of the legislative branch, the judiciary, the municipal government of the District of Columbia, or the Canal Zone Government.

Subject to the determination of any question as to the legal authority for establishing or raising fees (see par. 6), types of activities covered by the circular include, but are not limited to, the following:

Certificates of public convenience and necessity issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Federal Power Commission;

Patents granted and trade-marks registered by the Patent Office of the Department of Commerce;

Radio operators' licenses and radio-station licenses issued by the Federal Communications Commission;

Registration, conditional exemptions from registration, and qualifications filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission;

Visas, passports, and similar permits issued by the Department of State;

Airman certificates issued by the Civil Aeronautics Administration;

Vessel-inspection certificates issued by the Coast Guard;

Certificates issued under the Pure Food and Drug Act; and

Licenses to classify, grade, or weigh agricultural products issued by the Department of Agriculture.

3. Determination of fees: It shall be the policy of Federal agencies engaged in licensing activities to provide a system of fair and equitable fees which, taking account of the value to the recipient and the public policy or interest served, shall recover, to the full extent possible, the aggregate cost incurred in the conduct of these activities.

In fixing fees for licensing activities, the general guides set forth below shall be followed:

(a) To the extent possible, each agency shall classify its various types of licensing proceedings into groups involving substantially comparable cost factors so as to obtain the basis for a general schedule of fees.

(b) Where there is relatively little variation in the cost of individual proceedings of a given type, the fees shall be set at a uniform level so as to recover all or substantially all of the cost of such type of proceedings.

(c) Where there is considerable variation in the cost of individual proceedings of a given type, the following principles shall apply:

(1) If it is possible to classify applications in advance on the basis of probable cost of the resulting proceedings, especially by using suitable units of measurement, the agency shall establish a graduated-fee scale based upon such classification.

(2) If it is not possible to classify the applications in advance, the agency shall establish a uniform fee designed to recover as much as possible of the cost to the agency for proceedings of such type, while minimizing the burden to applicants in low-cost proceedings.

(d) In those cases in which fees, if established in accordance with subparagraphs (a), (b), and (c) above, would not fully meet the policy set forth at the opening of this paragraph, or in which it appears to the agency that fees, if so established, would be less likely to be fair and equitable, the agency shall supplement these specific fees with a system of more general fees to be paid annually by all parties holding such licenses. These general fees might, for example, take the form of annual registration fees graduated in relation to volume of business, revenue, or other appropriate characteristic of the individual entities subject to such regulation. In cases where annual fees are appropriate, the agency should seek such statutory authorization as may be necessary to impose such fees (see par. 6).

4. Determination of cost: For purposes of this circular, cost of licensing includes:

(a) Direct labor costs of personnel assigned to carrying out the licensing activities full time or part time. These include the costs of personnel assigned to processing applications, conducting hearings, publishing decisions, conducting staff analyses, and making inspections or examinations directly related to the issuance, modification, renewal, transfer, or termination of a license.

(b) The purchase price of supplies and materials and the costs of contractual services used in the licensing activity.

(c) An appropriate share of the original cost (depreciation) of equipment used, and the cost of maintenance and operation of such equipment.

(d) An additional cost factor of not less than 15 percent of the sum of the above costs, to cover generally such indirect costs as agency overhead, collection and deposit of fees, maintenance, operation, and depreciation of buildings, the Government's share of the retirement or social-security benefits for the employees, workmen's compensation, and work performed by central agencies.

(e) Cost, as defined in this circular, does not include enforcement activities, rate regulation, denial proceedings instituted by the agency when involving charges of misconduct, or revocation proceedings.

Where adequate cost accounts are kept, they shall be used in determining the fees established under this circular. Where cost accounts are not kept, each agency shall make at least once every 2 years such sample studies or surveys of costs as are necessary to obtain a reasonable approximation of costs. Such studies or surveys shall be kept available for comparison.

5. Possible exceptions to cost recovery: At the discretion of the agency head, the agency may make exceptions to cost recovery either by exempting licensees specified below or by fixing fees so as to recover less than full cost under conditions stated below:

(a) State or local governments or their agents when payment of the full fee would

not be in the interest of the program or would conflict with State law.

(b) Foreign countries or international organizations or their agents when the furnishing of the service without charge is an appropriate courtesy.

(c) Nationals of a foreign country with which comparable fees are set on a reciprocal basis.

(d) Charitable nonprofit organizations.

(e) When full-cost recovery would manifestly impair the public interest.

(f) When the cost of collecting the fees would outweigh the cost of the activity.

6. Changes in existing law: In any case where the collection of a fee for services of the types covered by this circular is prohibited by statute or Executive order, or where a statute or Executive order requires a fee for any service to be lower than that which would be required by this circular, the agency concerned shall submit to the Bureau of the Budget, under the established clearance procedure, drafts of such legislation or Executive order as may be necessary to permit the fixing of fees as required by this circular. The drafts should be accompanied by such recommendations as the agency head may deem appropriate.

7. Timing of initial action under this circular: Cost studies or surveys shall be so scheduled that the proposed schedule of fees will be announced on or before February 1, 1954.

To the extent that changes in existing statutes or Executive orders are required, the agency head shall complete the steps set forth in paragraph 6 above on or before January 1, 1954.

8. Announcement and review of fee schedules: Prior to the establishment of a fee schedule, each agency shall provide a reasonable opportunity for affected parties to present comments and suggestions as to the level and form of the proposed fees. This requirement is in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other procedural requirement which may be applicable to changes in fee schedules by the agency concerned.

Fee schedules shall be reviewed by each agency at least once every 2 years.

9. Report to the Bureau of the Budget: The head of each agency shall make a report to the Bureau of the Budget on or before May 1, 1954, on the steps he has taken to comply with the circular. The report shall list the licensing activities of the agency and indicate the steps taken to reexamine costs and fees, the specific schedules of fees prescribed under this circular (or where none has been prescribed, the reasons therefor), the effective dates of such schedules, the anticipated change in income from such fees for the fiscal years 1954 and 1955 (showing the annual income and change therein distributed according to the accounts credited), and the steps taken under paragraph 6 of this circular.

JOSEPH M. DODGE,

Director

(By direction of the President).

ISSUANCE OF NEW 8-CENT STAMP BEARING MOTTO "IN GOD WE TRUST"

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, yesterday I made a statement regarding the ceremonies in connection with the issuance of a new stamp by the Post Office Department, and in connection therewith I placed in the RECORD a statement by the Postmaster General. At that time I did not have a transcript of the complete proceedings during the 15-minute program. I now ask unanimous consent

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued April 15, 1954
For actions of April 13 & 14, 1954
83rd-2nd, Nos. 68, 69

CONTENTS

ACP.....3	Federal aid.....3	Price supports.....10,33
Adjournment.....17	Fisheries.....9,30	Prices, farm.....33
Appropriations.....3,16	Flood prevention.....3	Reports.....13
Budgeting.....28	Food, distribution.....14,29	Research.....1,3,30,31
Buildings.....11	Foreign trade.....24	Road authorizations.....1,4
Civil defense.....19	Forestry.....1,3	School lunch.....3,14,20
Corn.....31	Frozen food.....30	Soil conservation.....3,7
Dairy industry.....10,14,29,33	Lands.....18	Statistics.....6
Disease eradication.....15	Legislative program.....8,17	St. Lawrence Seaway.....27
Education.....16	Loans, farm.....21,34	Sugar.....12,32
Electrification.....5	Marketing.....3	Surplus commodities.....22
Experiment stations.....3	Minerals.....18	Taxation.....25
Extension Service.....3	Personnel.....23,26	Wool.....10
Farm program.....2		

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed agricultural appropriation bill. Both Houses agreed to conference report on road-authorizations bill. Sen. Douglas introduced and discussed bill to dispose of surplus commodities. Senate debated buildings lease-purchase bill. Senate committee reported fish-marketing bill. Sen. Thye submitted and discussed amendment to wool bill to establish 85% dairy supports. Rep. Stringfellow inserted Secretary's research speech.

HOUSE - April 13

1. ROAD AUTHORIZATIONS. Received the conference report on H. R. 8127, authorizing road appropriations for the fiscal years 1956 and 1957 (pp. 4782-6). The conferees agreed to the House figure of \$22,500,000 for forest highways (Senate figure, \$25,000,000), and agreed to \$24,000,000 for forest roads and trails (House, \$22,500,000; Senate, \$25,000,000). The conferees agreed to the Senate amendment authorizing the Commerce Department to conduct research on roads and traffic. The conferees also adopted the Senate provision that any funds authorized for the fiscal year 1955, or authorized under this bill for forest highways forest roads and trails, etc., shall be immediately available for contract.
2. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Staggers requested that additional attention be given to the small farmer in connection with development of farm programs (p. 4782).

HOUSE - April 14

3. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955. Passed with amendments this bill, H. R. 8779 (pp. 4862-85, A2780, A2789-91, A2799-800).
Agreed to the following amendments:
By Rep. Hunter, to increase the research item of ARS from \$33,154,365 to \$35,353,000 (the budget estimate); by a teller vote of 151 to 30 (p. 4862).
By Rep. Cotton, to increase payments to State Extension Services from

- \$35,610,279 to \$39,675,000 (the budget estimate); by a voice vote (pp. 4870-3).
By Rep. Ford, to increase Federal Extension Service from \$1,381,235 to \$1,925,000 (the budget estimate), and penalty mail from \$1,885,000 to \$2,000,000; by a voice vote (pp. 4873-4).
By Rep. Andersen, to increase forest roads and trails from \$14,498,000 to \$16,000,000 (the budget estimate); by a division vote of 92 to 24 (p. 4876).
By Rep. Hagen, Minn., to increase Soil Conservation Service operations item from \$58,165,671 to \$58,965,671, providing \$800,000 for continued free distribution of soil and land capability maps to farmers in lieu of sale, as contemplated in the budget; by a division vote of 51 to 45 (p. 4876).
By Rep. Forrester, to authorize use of not to exceed \$28,000 of the ARS research appropriation for construction or purchase of a pecan research station at Albany, Ga.; by a voice vote (pp. 4862-3).
By Rep. Cederberg, to increase payments to State Experiment Stations from \$15,453,708 to \$19,453,708 (the budget estimate); by a voice vote (pp. 4869-70).
By Rep. Horan, to increase marketing research and agricultural estimates, ARS, from \$9,100,800 to \$10,215,000 (the budget estimate); by a voice vote (p. 4882).
By Rep. Laird, to increase payments to State departments of agriculture, markets etc., from \$573,000 to \$900,000 (the budget estimate); by a voice vote (pp. 4883-4).
By Rep. Cannon, to increase school lunch program from \$77,011,416 to \$83,464,000, which is an increase of \$15,464,000 above the budget estimate of \$68,000,000; by a voice vote (pp. 4882-3).
By Rep. Hill, to increase Forest Service research from \$6,170,564 to \$6,528,500 (the budget estimate); by a voice vote (pp. 4874-5).

Rejected the following amendments:

- By Rep. Moss, to increase the ARS item for plant and animal diseases and pest control by \$35,200 for control of Hall scale; by a voice vote (pp. 4868-9).
By Rep. Fisher, Tex., to increase flood prevention by \$5,000,000; by a division vote of 41 to 71 (pp. 4877-8).
By Rep. King, Pa., to decrease the advance authorization for the 1955 Agricultural Conservation Program from \$250,000,000 to \$140,000,000; by a division vote of 29 to 83 (pp. 4878-80).
By Rep. Fulton, to reduce the maximum payment permissible under ACP from \$1,500 to \$1,000; by a division vote of 13 to 80 (pp. 4880-2).

An amendment by Rep. King., Pa., providing that no ACP payment may be made on land which during any 1 of the previous 10 years has been the location of a practice for which payments were made, was ruled out of order (p. 4884).

4. ROAD AUTHORIZATIONS. Agreed, 134-9, to the conference report on H. R. 8127, the road-authorizations bill (pp. 4856-9). The Senate also agreed to the report (pp. 4834-9). This bill will now be sent to the President.
5. ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Pfoff defended herself against charges by the utility companies (pp. 4889-92).
6. STATISTICS. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported without amendment H. R. 8487, to provide for censuses of manufactures, mineral industries, and other businesses for 1954 (H. Rept. 1539) (p. 4893).
7. SOIL CONSERVATION. Rep. Jenkins described plans for SCS work on the Upper Hocking watershed (p. 4853).
8. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. The Consent and Private Calendars are to be considered Apr. 26 (p. 4885).

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1954

APRIL 13, 1954.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. DONDERO, from the committee of conference,
submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 8127]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8127) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert *That, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), and all Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$700,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.*

The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be available for expenditure as follows:

(a) *\$315,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system.*

(b) *\$210,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid secondary system.*

(c) *\$175,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system in urban areas, and for projects on approved extensions of the Federal-aid secondary system within urban areas.*

The sums authorized by this section for each fiscal year, respectively, shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with the formulas set forth in section 4 of the

Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838).

Any sums apportioned to any State under the provision of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for two years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized, and any amounts so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse: Provided, That such funds for any fiscal year shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums apportioned to the State for such fiscal year is covered by formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the improvement of specific projects as provided by this Act: Provided further, That in the case of those sums heretofore, herein, or hereafter apportioned to any State for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system, the Secretary of Commerce may, upon the request of any State, discharge his responsibility relative to the plans, specifications, estimates, surveys, contract awards, design, inspection, and construction of such secondary road projects by his receiving and approving a certified statement by the State highway department setting forth that the plans, design, and construction for such projects are in accord with the standards and procedures of such State applicable to projects in this category approved by him: Provided further, That such approval shall not be given unless such standards and procedures are in accordance with the objectives set forth in section 1 (b) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950: Provided further, That nothing contained in the foregoing provisos shall be construed to relieve any State of its obligation now provided by law relative to maintenance, nor to relieve the Secretary of Commerce of his obligation with respect to the selection of the secondary system or the location of projects thereon, to make a final inspection after construction of each project, and to require an adequate showing of the estimated and actual cost of construction of each project: Provided further, That not more than 10 per centum of the amount apportioned to each State under subparagraphs (a), (b), or (c) of this section may be transferred from the apportionment under one subparagraph to the apportionment under either of the other subparagraphs: Provided further, That such transfer is requested by the State highway department and is approved by the Governor of said State and the Secretary of Commerce as being in the public interest: Provided further, That the total of such transfers shall not increase the original apportionment under any subparagraph by more than 10 per centum: Provided further, that the transfers hereinabove permitted for funds authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1956, and June 30, 1957, shall likewise be permitted on the same basis for funds heretofore or hereafter authorized to be appropriated for any prior or subsequent fiscal year: And provided further, That nothing herein contained shall be deemed to alter or impair the authority contained in the last proviso to subparagraph (b) of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944.

SEC. 2. (a) *For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, and improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the national system of interstate highways, including extensions thereof through urban areas, designated in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of \$175,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like additional sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957. The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be apportioned among the several States in the following manner:*

one-half in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, as shown by the latest available Federal census: Provided, That no State shall receive less than three-fourths of 1 per centum of the money so apportioned; and one-half in the manner now provided by law for apportionment of funds for the Federal-aid primary system: Provided further, That the Federal share payable on account of any project on the national system of interstate highways provided for by funds made available under the provisions of this section shall be increased to 60 per centum of the total cost thereof, plus a percentage of the remaining 40 per centum of such cost in any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 per centum of the total area of all lands therein, equal to the percentage that the area of such lands in such State is of its total area.

(b) Any sums apportioned to any State under the provisions of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for two years after the close of fiscal year for which such sums are authorized: Provided, That such funds shall be deemed to be expended upon execution of formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the improvement of specific projects under this section.

(c) Any amount apportioned to the States under the provisions of this section unexpended at the end of the period during which it is available for expenditure under the terms of subsection (b) of this section shall lapse.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218), as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of \$22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957; and (2) for forest development roads and trails the sum of \$24,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957: Provided, That with respect to any proposed construction or reconstruction of a timber access road, advisory public hearings shall be held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area of construction or reconstruction with notice and reasonable opportunity for interested persons to present their views as to the practicability and feasibility of such construction or reconstruction: Provided further, That hereafter funds available for forest development roads and trails shall also be available for vehicular parking areas: Provided further, That the appropriation herein authorized for forest highways shall be apportioned by the Secretary of Commerce for expenditure in the several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico in accordance with the provision of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950.

SEC. 4. (a) For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas administered by the National Park Service, including areas authorized to be established as national parks and monuments, and national park and monument approach roads authorized by the Act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat. 1053), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$12,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

(b) For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of parkways, authorized by Acts of Congress, on lands to which title is vested in the United States, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of

\$11,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

(c) For the construction, improvement, and maintenance of Indian reservation roads and bridges and roads and bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian lands under the provisions of the Act approved May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957: Provided, That the location, type, and design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be approved by the Secretary of Commerce before any expenditures are made thereon, and all such construction shall be under the general supervision of the Secretary of Commerce.

SEC. 5. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 10 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the survey, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of main roads through unappropriated or unreserved public lands, nontaxable Indian lands, or other Federal reservations the sum of \$1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, to remain available until expended.

SEC. 6. Any funds authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, or herein authorized for forest highways, forest development roads and trails, park roads and trails, parkways, Indian roads, and public lands highways shall be immediately available for contract: Provided, That any amount remaining unexpended two years after the close of the fiscal year for which authorized shall lapse. The Secretary of the Department charged with the administration of such funds is hereby granted authority to incur obligations, approve projects, and enter into contracts under such authorizations and his action in doing so shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof and such funds shall be deemed to have been expended when so obligated.

SEC. 7. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 1 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for cooperation with Central American Republics in the construction of the Inter-American Highway", approved December 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 860), as amended by section 11 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to the sums heretofore authorized, the sum of \$8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and a like sum for each fiscal year thereafter up to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, to be available until expended, to enable the United States to cooperate with the Governments of the American Republics situated in Central America—that is, with the Governments of the Republics of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama—in the survey and completion of construction of the Inter-American Highway within the borders of the aforesaid Republics, respectively. Not to exceed one-third of the appropriation authorized for each fiscal year may be expended without requiring the country or countries in which such sums may be expended to match any part thereof, if the Secretary of State shall find that the cost of constructing said highway in such country or countries will be beyond their reasonable capacity to bear.

SEC. 8. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 5 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 158), there is hereby

authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State, in addition to the sums heretofore authorized, the sum of \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, to be available until expended, for completing the United States obligation under the applicable agreement with the Republic of Nicaragua: *Provided, That the survey and construction work authorized by the said section 5 shall be under the general supervision of the Secretary of Commerce.*

SEC. 9. *In order to assure that adequate consideration is given to civil defense aspects in the planning and construction of highways constructed or reconstructed with the aid of Federal funds, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to consult, from time to time, with the Federal Civil Defense Administrator relative to the civil defense aspects of highways so constructed or reconstructed.*

SEC. 10. (a) *The Secretary of Commerce is authorized in his discretion to engage in research on all phases of highway construction, reconstruction, modernization, development, design, maintenance, safety, financing, and traffic conditions, including the effect thereon of State laws, and is authorized to test, develop, or assist in the testing and developing of any material, invention, patented article, or process. The Secretary may carry out the authority granted hereby, either independently, or in cooperation with any other branch of the Government, State agency, authority, association, institution, corporation (profit or nonprofit), or any other organization, or person. The funds required to carry out the provisions of this subsection shall be taken out of the administrative and research funds authorized by section 21 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 212), as amended. The provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C., sec. 5) shall not be applicable to contracts or agreements made under the authority of this subsection.*

(b) *The Secretary shall include in the highway research program herein authorized studies of economic highway geometrics, structures and desirable weight and size standards for vehicles using the public highways and of the feasibility of uniformity in State regulations with respect to such standards, and he shall report from time to time to the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and of the House of Representatives on the progress and findings with respect to such studies.*

SEC. 11. *The Secretary of Commerce is hereby directed to make a study in cooperation with the State highway departments and other parties in interest relative to the problems posed by necessary relocation and reconstruction of public utilities services resulting from highway improvements authorized under this Act. Among other things, such a study shall include a review and financial analysis of existing relationships between the State highway departments and affected utilities of all types, and a review of the various State statutes regulating existing relationships, to the end that a full and informative report may be made to the President for transmittal to the Congress of the United States not later than February 1, 1955.*

SEC. 12. *The Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to transmit to the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and of the House of Representatives not later than December 31, 1954, a suggested draft of a bill or bills for a Federal Highway Act, which will include such provisions of existing law, and such changed or new provisions as the Secretary deems advisable. The Secretary shall also submit a report commenting on the draft of bill or bills, which shall include specific reference to each change in, or omission of, any provision of existing law.*

SEC. 13. The Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized and directed to make a comprehensive study of all phases of highway financing, including a study of the costs of completing the several systems of highways in the several States and of the progress and feasibility of toll roads with particular attention to the possible effects of such toll roads upon the Federal-aid highway programs, and coordination thereof, and to make a report of his findings including recommendations with respect to Federal participation in toll roads, to be submitted to the Congress not later than February 1, 1955: Provided, That not to exceed \$100,000 from funds available for administrative expenses shall be expended for the purposes of this section.

SEC. 14. For the purpose of expediting the interstate planning and coordination of a continuous Great River Road and appurtenances thereto traversing the Mississippi Valley from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico in general conformity with the provisions of the Federal Aid Road Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and with the recommended plan set forth in the joint report submitted to the Congress November 28, 1951, by the Secretaries of Commerce and Interior pursuant to the Act of August 24, 1949 (Public Law 262, Eighty-first Congress), there is hereby authorized to be expended by the Secretary of Commerce from general administrative funds not to exceed \$250,000; the amount expended under this section shall be apportioned among the ten States bordering the Mississippi River in proportion to the amount allocated by these respective States for the improvement and extension of existing sections of this highway project as approved by the Secretary of Commerce in cooperation with other public agencies concerned therewith.

SEC. 15. The term "highway", as defined in section 2 of the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921 (42 Stat. 212), as amended and supplemented, shall be deemed to include "tunnels".

SEC. 16. The Secretary of Commerce may approve as a part of the Federal-aid secondary system, extensions through urban areas, connecting points on that system, provided that Federal participation in projects on such extensions shall be limited to urban funds.

SEC. 17. (a) Highway construction work performed in pursuance of agreements between the Secretary of Commerce and any State highway department which requires approval by the Secretary of Commerce and which is financed in whole or in part by funds authorized under this or succeeding Acts, shall be performed by contract awarded by competitive bidding under such procedures as may by regulations be prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce, unless the Secretary of Commerce shall affirmatively find that, under the circumstances relating to a given project, some other method is in the public interest. All such findings shall be reported promptly in writing to the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

(b) In any case in which approval by the Secretary of Commerce of any contract for such highway construction work is required, the Secretary shall require as a condition precedent to such approval a sworn statement executed by, or on behalf of, the person, firm, association, or corporation to whom such contract is to be awarded, certifying that such person, firm, association, or corporation has not, either directly or indirectly, entered into any agreement, participated in any collusion, or otherwise taken any action in restraint of free competitive bidding in connection with such contract.

SEC. 18. Section 1020 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

“§ 1020. Highway projects

“Whoever, being an officer, agent, or employee of the United States, or of any State or Territory, or whoever, whether a person, association, firm, or corporation, knowingly makes any false statement, false representation, or false report as to the character, quality, quantity, or cost of the material used or to be used, or the quantity or quality of the work performed or to be performed, or the costs thereof in connection with the submission of plans, maps, specifications, contracts, or costs of construction of any highway or related project submitted for approval to the Secretary of Commerce; or

“Whoever knowingly makes any false statement, false representation, false report, or false claim with respect to the character, quality, quantity, or cost of any work performed or to be performed, or materials furnished or to be furnished, in connection with the construction of any highway or related project approved by the Secretary of Commerce; or

“Whoever knowingly makes any false statement or false representation as to a material fact in any statement, certificate, or report submitted pursuant to the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented,

“Shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.”

SEC. 19. All provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838); the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, approved June 29, 1948 (62 Stat. 1105); and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785); and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952, approved June 25, 1952 (66 Stat. 158), not inconsistent with this Act, shall remain in full force and effect.

SEC. 20. If any section, subsection, or other provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act and the application of such section, subsection, or other provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 21. All Acts or parts of Acts in any way inconsistent with the provisions of this Act are hereby repealed, and this Act shall take effect on its passage.

SEC. 22. (a) That all Federal-aid road funds heretofore paid on the section of Federal-Aid Primary Route Numbered 39 included in Federal-aid project UI-147 in the State of Connecticut, which section is to be made a part of a highway from the New York State line at Greenwich to the Rhode Island State line at Killingly, planned as an expressway authorized by chapter 107, part IV, General Statutes of Connecticut, 1953 Supplement, shall, prior to the collection of any tolls on said section, be repaid to the Treasurer of the United States, and the amount so repaid shall be deposited to the credit of the appropriation for Federal-aid highways. At the time of such repayment, the project agreement with respect to said Federal-aid project UI-147 shall be cancelled. Any amount so repaid, together with the unpaid balance of any amount programmed for expenditure on said project, shall be credited to the unprogramed balance of Federal-aid road funds of the same class last apportioned to the State of Connecticut. The amount so credited shall be in addition to all other funds than ap-

portioned to said State and shall be available for expenditure in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 212), as now or hereafter amended and supplemented.

(b) By virtue of the design and plan of said highway in relation to the three sections of Federal-Aid Primary Route Numbered 1 included in Federal-aid projects UI-29, UI-64, and FI-145, which permit unrestricted use of said sections without payment of tolls, it is hereby declared that the incorporation of said sections into said highway will not violate any provision of said Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, or any regulation thereunder. If at any time the highway commissioner of the State of Connecticut shall determine to impose tolls upon or for the use of any one or more of said sections, all Federal-aid road funds theretofore paid or programed for expenditure on such section or sections upon which tolls are to be imposed, shall be transferred for programing and expenditure in cooperation with the Connecticut State Highway Department pursuant to the provisions of said Federal Highway Act, as now or hereafter amended and supplemented. At the time of such transfer, the project agreement with respect to the project for which the funds are transferred shall be canceled. Upon such cancellation, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to credit the Federal pro rata share of such project agreement to the unprogramed balance of Federal-aid road funds of the same class last apportioned to the State of Connecticut. The amount so credited shall be in addition to all other funds then apportioned to said State and shall be available for expenditure in accordance with the provisions of said Federal Highway Act, as now or hereafter amended and supplemented. In lieu of the transfer thereof, the highway commissioner of the State of Connecticut may repay the Federal-aid road funds paid on any such section in the same manner and with the same effect as is provided with respect to the repayment of Federal-aid road funds in subsection (a) of this section.

(c) Upon the repayment or transfer of Federal-aid road funds, as hereinbefore provided, any such section or sections included in the project with respect to which such repayment or transfer is made, shall become and be free from any and all restrictions contained in said Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, or any regulation thereunder, with respect to the imposition and collection of tolls or other charges thereon or for the use thereof.

SEC. 23. This Act may be cited as the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954".

And the Senate agree to the same.

GEO. A. DONDERO,
HOMER D. ANGELL,
J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
GEORGE H. FALLON,
CLIFFORD DAVIS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

EDWARD MARTIN,
FRANCIS CASE,
PRESCOTT BUSH,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
JOHN STENNIS,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8127) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Highway Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to such amendment, namely:

The Senate struck all after the enacting clause of the House bill and inserted in lieu thereof an amendment which was a complete substitute for the text of the House bill. However, the provisions of the House bill and the Senate amendment were substantially similar but the Senate included a number of sections not contained in the House bill. The following statement indicates the differences between the House bill and the Senate amendment and the action of the conferees with respect to these differences.

PRIMARY, SECONDARY, AND PRIMARY ROADS IN URBAN AREAS

Section 1 of the conference agreement authorizes \$700,000,000 for appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1956, and June 30, 1957, on the basis of 45 percent for the Federal-aid primary system, 30 percent for the Federal-aid secondary system, and 25 percent for the Federal-aid urban system, thus authorizing \$315,000,000 for the primary highway system, \$210,000,000 for the secondary highway system, and \$175,000,000 for the primary system in urban areas.

With respect to the foregoing authorizations, the House authorized \$270,000,000 for the primary system, \$180,000,000 for the secondary system, and \$150,000,000 for the primary system in urban areas. The Senate amendment authorized \$342,000,000 for the primary system, \$228,000,000 for the secondary system, and \$190,000,000 for the primary system in urban areas. The conferees finally compromised and agreed on the amounts now contained in the bill herein reported.

The House conferees prevailed upon the Senate conferees to agree to the provision relative to permission to transfer primary and secondary funds in either direction. This provision was not contained in the Senate amendment and the conferees agreed to the transfer of such funds up to 10 percent instead of up to 25 percent which was contained in the House bill. The conferees also agreed to modifying language which would make such transfer permissible if approved by the governor of the State requesting such transfer as well as with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce. With respect to secondary roads the conferees agreed to an amendment to clarify the language which would assist the Secretary of Commerce in carrying out the purposes of this provision in a manner consistent with the procedures presently in effect.

INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS

Section 2 of the House bill authorized the sum of \$200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, for projects on the interstate highway system. The Senate amendment authorized the sum of \$150,000,000 for identical purposes covering the same period of time. The conferees finally compromised on the sum of \$175,000,000 for each fiscal year.

FOREST HIGHWAYS, FOREST DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

Section 3: The Senate conferees agreed to the authorization of \$22,500,000 for forest highways contained in the House bill. The amount contained in the Senate amendment was \$25,000,000.

With respect to forest development roads and trails, the conferees agreed to the authorization of \$24,000,000 in lieu of \$22,500,000 in the House bill and \$25,000,000 authorized in the Senate amendment.

PARK SERVICE ROADS, PARKWAYS, AND INDIAN ROADS

Section 4: The conferees agreed to the authorization of \$12,500,000 for park roads and trails which amount was contained in the Senate amendment. The House bill authorized \$10,000,000 for this purpose.

The conferees agreed to the authorization of \$11,000,000 for parkways in lieu of \$10,000,000 authorized in the House bill and \$12,500,000 authorized in the Senate amendment.

The conferees agreed to the authorization of \$10,000,000 for Indian roads and trails which was the amount contained in the House bill. The Senate amendment authorized \$12,500,000.

PUBLIC LANDS ROADS

The Senate amendment carried an authorization of \$2,500,000 for public lands roads. There was no such authorization in the House bill. The House conferees accepted this section with the amount reduced to \$1,000,000 per fiscal year.

AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR FEDERAL ROADS

Section 6 provides that any funds authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, or authorized under this bill for forest highways, forest development roads and trails, park roads and trails, Indian roads and public lands highways shall be immediately available for contract. This section was not contained in the House bill, but the House conferees agreed to its inclusion when they prevailed upon the Senate to restrict the provisions to the fiscal years 1955, 1956, and 1957.

INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

Section 7: The Senate amendment provided an authorization of \$40,000,000 to complete this project to be appropriated in the amount of \$8,000,000 for each of 5 fiscal years ending June 30, 1959. The House bill did not contain such a provision but did provide for the continuation of the authorizations set forth in section 6 of the Federal-

Aid Highway Act of 1952. The House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment.

RAMA ROAD

Section 8: The Senate amendment provided an authorization of \$2,000,000 for the fiscal years 1955 and 1956. The House bill did not contain such a provision but did provide for the continuation of the authorizations set forth in section 5 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952. The House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment.

CIVIL DEFENSE

Section 9: The Senate amendment authorizes and directs the Secretary of Commerce to consult with the Civil Defense Administrator relative to the civil defense aspects of highways to be constructed or reconstructed. There was no such provision in the House bill. The House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment with respect to this section.

GENERAL RESEARCH STUDIES

Section 10 authorizes the Secretary of Commerce in his discretion to engage in research upon all phases of highway construction, reconstruction, modification, development, design, maintenance, safety, financing, and traffic conditions including the effect thereon of State laws and to test, develop, or assist in the testing and development of any material, invention, patented article or process as well as studies of desirable weight size standards for vehicles using the public highways. The funds required to carry out the provisions of this section shall be taken out of administrative research funds. There was no such authorization in the House bill. The House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment with respect to this section.

REVISION OF HIGHWAY LAW

Section 12: This provision directs the Secretary of Commerce to submit to the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, not later than December 1, 1954, a suggested draft of a bill or bills for a Federal highway act which will include such provisions of existing law and such change or new provisions as the Secretary deems advisable. There was no such authorization or direction in the House bill. The House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment with respect to this section.

TOLL ROAD STUDY

Section 13: The Senate amendment carried an authorization and direction to the Commissioner of Public Roads to make a comprehensive study of all phases of highway financing, including a study of costs of completing the several systems of highways in the several States and of the progress and feasibility of toll roads with particular attention to the possible effects of such toll roads upon the Federal-aid highway program and to report to the Congress not later than February 1, 1955. The cost of the study shall not exceed \$100,000

but shall be payable from administrative expenses. The House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment with respect to this section. There was no such authorization in the House bill.

AUTHORIZING PRESIDENT TO ADVANCE EFFECTIVE DATES OF THIS ACT

The Senate amendment provided in section 14 for the President, under certain circumstances, to advance the effective dates of any authorizations except those with respect to the Inter-American Highway and Rama Road if he so determined. There was no such authorization in the House bill. Conferees agreed that this provision be excluded.

GREAT RIVER ROAD

Section 14: The Senate amendment (sec. 15) provided an authorization of not to exceed \$100,000 from administration funds for the purpose of expediting the interstate planning and coordination of a continuous Great River Road and appurtenances thereto traversing the Mississippi Valley from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico. The House bill provided for like purposes but authorized an amount not to exceed \$250,000 to be expended from administration funds. The Senate conferees agreed to the amendment contained in the House bill.

CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATIONS

Section 17: This provision (sec. 18 of the Senate amendment) provides that highway construction work performed in pursuance of agreements between the Secretary of Commerce and any State highway department which requires approval by the Secretary of Commerce and which is financed in whole or in part by funds authorized under this or succeeding acts shall be performed by contract awarded by competitive bidding under such procedures as may by regulations be prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce, unless he shall affirmatively find that under the circumstances relating to a given project, some other method is in the public interest. Conferees understand that this section does not alter existing procedures with respect to railroad projects involved in the highway program. This section also provides that the Secretary of Commerce, when his approval of any contract is required, shall obtain a sworn statement from the person to whom such contract is to be awarded certifying that such person has not engaged in collusive bidding. The House bill did not contain this section and the House conferees concurred in the Senate amendment.

AMENDMENT OF CRIMINAL CODE

Section 18: This section (sec. 19 of the Senate amendment) was not contained in the House bill and the House conferees concurred in the language contained in the Senate amendment with respect to this section.

DEFENSE ACCESS ROADS

This provision (sec. 20 of the Senate amendment) was not contained in the House bill and the Senate conferees receded.

TOLL ROAD FUNDS

Section 22 (sec. 24 of the Senate amendment) was not contained in the House bill. This provision is intended to enable the State of Connecticut to save approximately \$17,000,000 by incorporating into a proposed expressway four sections of highway upon which Federal-aid funds have been, or are being expended. This would be accomplished by repayment in cash of the Federal-aid funds to the United States and their transfer for use on other projects eligible for Federal aid. There is precedent for this procedure in a law enacted by the 81st Congress to facilitate the construction of the New Jersey Turnpike. The House conferees concurred in the Senate amendment.

There was no disagreement among the conferees on sections 16, 17, 21, 22, 23, and 25 of the Senate amendment (secs. 10, 11, 6, 7, 8, and 13 of the House bill).

GEO. A. DONDERO,
HOMER D. ANGELL,
J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
GEORGE H. FALLON,
CLIFFORD DAVIS,

Managers on the Part of the House.



nee of an earlier century whose story exemplifies the contributions of the Scandinavian pioneers to the life and blood stream of America. This commemoration is further appropriate in that one of Montana's most distinguished citizens, J. Bruce Kremer, in his historical study, John Hanson, of Mulberry Grove, has recorded the contribution of this great patriot.

There is a long gap in years between the first settlement of the Swedes and Finns on the shores of the Delaware in the 17th century and the settlement of the Swedes, Danes, Finns, and Norwegians in the great area ranging from Michigan westward, but there is no gap at all between the strength and vigor of those pioneers of Delaware River country and that of the pioneers of that great western expanse of which Montana is now one State.

Of the 14 presidents to serve the Continental Congress, John Hanson was the first to be elected for a definite stated term under the Articles of Confederation. He was the unanimous choice of the Continental Congress on November 5, 1781.

The year of his presidency was one of the most significant in our history. The civil functions of the country had to be adjusted to the terms of the confederation, a department of foreign affairs needed much organizing, the war potentially won was not actually ended. He had already made his mark as the strong man of Maryland in that State's leadership in the establishment of the Federal lands between the seaboard States and the Mississippi, paving the way for the formation of additional separate and independent States in that area.

The marvel of his times lays in the conquering of a thousand obstacles, in the utter and genuine triumph of a people and their representatives in building a democracy.

The people of Montana know and respect their Scandinavian pioneers, in the words of Mr. Kremer, for "the courage and independence of their character, the soundness of their faith in democratic ideals of civilized social order, and the tremendous capacity of the whole of the Scandinavian races to build farms and homes and cities in a new land."

With this same respect we honor the birthday of John Hanson.

THE INDOCHINESE WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAHAM). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly concerned that we seem to be approaching nearer and nearer to military participation in the war in Indochina, although we have contributed heavily to France in money and material to carry on this war, on the theory that the French and Vietnamese soldiers would do the fighting if we aided them financially.

There is some comfort in the statement of President Eisenhower that this country will not be plunged into war

unless Congress, in the exercise of its constitutional power, declares war.

However, it would be difficult for Congress to refuse to declare war if the President and the Secretary of State commit our Government to fight, and the President, under such commitment, calls upon Congress to declare war. It begins to look dangerously like the American people are now being conditioned and readied for such an eventuality.

The anti-Communist side of the Indochinese War is being managed by France. We have no voice in it. We cannot make, dictate, or reject the policy as to how it would be conducted. We cannot set the goal or the objective to be attained. We cannot fix the terms as to when or how the war will be ended.

This is the kind of situation which the United Nations was set up to handle, and should handle, if it is to serve its purpose to maintain peace in the world.

We have carried the burden of the war in Korea, although the other free nations of the world stood to lose at least as much as America if the Communists won. Nations to whom we have given generously sent only token forces to aid us, and our casualties mounted 13 times as fast as those of other nations whose duty and obligation it was to shoulder their part of the burden. We know that some of our soldiers are still held in the cruelest kind of captivity by the Communists.

In addition to the tragic loss of 33,660 American lives, and total casualties of 103,327, we carried the burden of financing that war, and will carry the burden of rehabilitating South Korea, if peace ever comes there.

We must not lose sight of the fact that a part of Russia's plan to conquer us is to bleed us white, both as to finances and manpower. They have succeeded to a considerable extent so far. We must not permit ourselves to be made a victim of this scheme of the Communists.

We cannot go on forever at the pace we have been maintaining of military spending and worldwide spending, and fight and finance wars in Asia, at times and places selected by Russia, while Russia constantly grows stronger militarily and industrially.

Western European nations have pledged themselves to set up a defensive armed force. They are far behind the schedule fixed. Our Government should not make threats to our allies, but we should call upon them to live up to the commitments already made. We should call upon them to stand up and be counted now, and make firm commitments upon which we can rely, regarding the Asiatic situation.

Americans should not have additional tax burdens placed upon them, while the people of European nations have tax reductions. American fathers and mothers should not be called upon to send their sons to die on more foreign battlefields, while our allies refuse to join us. Above all things, we should not let the other nations lay this war in our lap, and stand by while we fight it.

Nothing substantial was achieved at the Berlin four-power conference. We

did not even get any worthwhile agreements from the Russian Communists; and if we had obtained an agreement from them to everything we proposed, such an agreement would not be worth the paper written upon. Surely we have learned by this time that the Communists regard an agreement only as a scrap of paper, and a solemn obligation something to be repudiated whenever it suits their convenience to repudiate it. We have placed ourselves now in the unfortunate position of agreeing to negotiate at the next conference with representatives of Red China, who, like Russia, could not be counted upon to live up to an agreement if they made one.

I think it is well that the President, through the State Department, is undertaking to solidify opposition to further Communist advancement in Indochina. I hope, as all Americans hope, that this effort will be successful and that the British and French will join us wholeheartedly, so that we may present a united front on this issue.

If they will do this, and if the French will measure up to their responsibilities in carrying on the fighting, there will be no necessity for American troops to participate in the Indochinese war. We should take no step, however, which would lead the British and French to believe that if they do not live up to their responsibilities, then America will step in and take the Indochinese war off their hands. Such action on our part would play into Russia's hands for the reason that it is a part of Russia's plot against our Government to cause us to bleed ourselves white, destroy our productive capacity through runaway inflation and unmanageable deficits, and when we have through such actions weakened ourselves, she hopes we will be at her mercy.

This is a most critical period in our country's history. At this moment, the principle objective of our Government should be to prevent our being taken into an Asiatic war through the back door. If we have to fight another war, which Almighty God forbid, we ourselves should select the time, the place, and the opponent.

PROBLEMS CONFRONTING THE NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak briefly about some of the grave problems that confront our Nation in this important year of decision.

Our beloved Nation was founded upon the great principles of religious freedom and the dignity of man. If we are to survive as the greatest democratic force in the world, we must at all times keep those principles firm in mind.

Our challenge is great, but we will prevail if we pursue a course of constructive, dynamic action, and, above all, not waver in our belief in God.

We are blessed with many natural resources. We are blessed with inventive genius that enables us to produce a ma-

for portion of the world's goods, although we have only a small percentage of the world's population.

Today as we look to the future we should be thankful for our great blessings. But at the same time we must not overlook our weaknesses, because only through finding solutions to our problems can we grow stronger spiritually, economically, and physically.

Speaking frankly, there are far too many Americans today who do not fully enjoy the blessings that should be available in this great democratic society. I propose, through legislative action, to correct some of these defects.

FARM POLICY

We can have a strong, healthy economy only if we have a sound farm program.

Our small farmers, as I have said on the floor of the House many times, are the backbone and bulwark of our national economy. Our Nation can prosper only if our small farmers prosper.

Today we find ourselves confronted with large surpluses of some commodities at a time when the incomes of many farmers are dropping and at a time when many of our people are not getting enough to eat.

This administration, in my opinion, should start working immediately on a farm program that will help the small farmer and at the same time make available farm surpluses to the many needy families.

Our farm parity program should be geared to afford maximum benefit to the small farmer. This was the intention of the farm program in the beginning, but I regret that it has now gotten to the place where major benefits go to the huge, commercial farms.

Through a revision of our farm program to afford greater assistance to the small farmer we would help raise the standards of living of approximately 20 million people. And, it would go a long way toward stabilizing our economy at a high level.

Farm surpluses, I repeat, should be made available to needy Americans in far greater quantities. Our elder citizens living on small pensions should be able to purchase these surpluses at substantially reduced prices.

There are some, I know, who complain that the administrative problems of such a program would be too great. I cannot agree. We have licked far tougher problems. And we could handle this program with comparative ease.

As for the cost of such a program, it would be very small indeed in comparison to the benefits it would provide for so many needy families. Certainly it would be small in comparison to the subsidies we now provide to many great industries.

The time to act is now.

SOCIAL SECURITY

In considering our domestic problems, we should keep in mind that our social security system affects virtually every family in the Nation.

There are few Americans today who do not recognize that social security has done a great deal for this Nation. Even those who opposed it bitterly in the past

now admit publicly that it is here to stay because of its widespread public support.

Since coming to Congress I have worked diligently for a better social-security program. I was one of the first to advocate the inclusion of State and municipal employees. I was one of the first to advocate the lowering of the age limit from 65 to 60 years. I was one of the first to advocate increased benefits and expansion of the disability-insurance program.

Today both major political parties agree that the system must be retained and expanded. But needy Americans will not benefit from these promises unless the Congress acts at once to revise the social-security law.

The social-security law was first enacted in the early 1930's when our Nation was in a tragic depression. It went a long way toward helping many of our elder citizens. In fact, it meant survival for many.

Fortunately times have changed. But I regret to say that revision and expansion of social security has not fully kept pace with changing times, and there is an urgent need now for action.

The increased cost of living has placed a serious burden upon all of us, but certainly it has most seriously affected our older citizens who are forced to live on a small, fixed income.

We should act at once to lower the age limit and increase benefits. We should increase the Government's financial contribution to old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the permanently disabled, and aid to dependent children.

Our social-security law should be revised to permit any group of workers who so desire to come under the benefits of the act. Those who desire to stay out from its coverage should be permitted to do so but the benefits should be available for those who desire them.

Social-security payments, contrary to what some propagandists say, are not old-age pensions; they are the result of savings made into the fund by workers and employers.

The basic philosophy of the law is to help the worker provide for his old age. It is sound. But, it should be broadened to enable our older citizens to derive full benefits even though they may be employed in jobs covered by social security.

Today a person who has reached the retirement age and earns more than \$75 a month from employment that is covered by social security will receive no old age and survivors insurance benefits. This section of the law needs to be taken out entirely.

Our elder citizens deserve to live in dignity, and I feel they should have the full benefits even though they continue to work. This is a step toward improving our society. It is a step we should take now.

One of the best ways we can demonstrate to all the world that this is a humanitarian, intelligent, Democratic Nation is to act now to provide a program that will enable our elder citizens to live in dignity and self-respect.

In making a survey of my district I find that 9 out of 10 of the farmers I have talked to want to have the oppor-

tunity of coming under the social-security system on a voluntary basis.

In making a similar survey of the ministers of my district I received almost unanimous approval from this group for voluntary participation in this program the same as other workers in our country.

H. R. 8127

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill H. R. 8127 have until midnight tonight to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1527)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8127) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), and all Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$700,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

"The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be available for expenditure as follows:

"(a) \$315,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system.

"(b) \$210,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid secondary system.

"(c) \$175,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system in urban areas, and for projects on approved extensions of the Federal-aid secondary system within urban areas.

"The sums authorized by this section for each fiscal year, respectively, shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with the formulas set forth in section 4 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838).

"Any sums apportioned to any State under the provision of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for two years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized, and any amounts so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse: *Provided*, That such funds for any fiscal year shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums apportioned to the State for such fiscal year is covered by formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the improvement of specific projects as provided by this Act: *Provided further*, That in the case of those sums heretofore, herein, or hereafter apportioned to any State for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system, the Sec-

retary of Commerce may, upon the request of any State, discharge his responsibility relative to the plans, specifications, estimates, surveys, contract awards, design, inspection, and construction of such secondary road projects by his receiving and approving a certified statement by the State highway department setting forth that the plans, design, and construction for such projects are in accord with the standards and procedures of such State applicable to projects in this category approved by him: *Provided further*, That such approval shall not be given unless such standards and procedures are in accordance with the objectives set forth in section 1 (b) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950: *Provided further*, That nothing contained in the foregoing provisos shall be construed to relieve any State of its obligation now provided by law relative to maintenance, nor to relieve the Secretary of Commerce of his obligation with respect to the selection of the secondary system or the location of projects thereon, to make a final inspection after construction of each project, and to require an adequate showing of the estimated and actual cost of construction of each project: *Provided further*, That not more than 10 per centum of the amount apportioned to each State under subparagraphs (a), (b), or (c) of this section may be transferred from the apportionment under one subparagraph to the apportionment under either of the other subparagraphs: *Provided further*, That such transfer is requested by the State highway department and is approved by the Governor of said State and the Secretary of Commerce as being in the public interest: *Provided further*, That the total of such transfers shall not increase the original apportionment under any subparagraph by more than 10 per centum: *Provided further*, That the transfers hereinabove permitted for funds authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1956, and June 30, 1957, shall likewise be permitted on the same basis for funds heretofore or hereafter authorized to be appropriated for any prior or subsequent fiscal year: *And provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be deemed to alter or impair the authority contained in the last proviso to subparagraph (b) of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944.

"SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, and improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the national system of interstate highways, including extensions thereof through urban areas, designated in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (53 Stat. 838), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of \$175,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like additional sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957. The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be apportioned among the several States in the following manner: one-half in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, as shown by the latest available Federal census: *Provided*, That no State shall receive less than three-fourths of 1 per centum of the money so apportioned; and one-half in the manner now provided by law for apportionment of funds for the Federal-aid primary system: *Provided further*, That the Federal share payable on account of any project on the national system of interstate highways provided for by funds made available under the provisions of this section shall be increased to 60 per centum of the total cost thereof, plus a percentage of the remaining 40 per centum of such cost in any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 per centum

of the total area of all lands therein, equal to the percentage that the area of such lands in such State is of its total area.

"(b) Any sums apportioned, to any State under the provisions of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for two years after the close of fiscal year for which such sums are authorized: *Provided*, That such funds shall be deemed to be expended upon execution of formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the improvement of specific projects under this section.

"(c) Any amount apportioned to the States under the provisions of this section unexpended at the end of the period during which it is available for expenditure under the terms of subsection (b) of this section shall lapse.

"SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218), as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of \$22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957; and (2) for forest development roads and trails the sum of \$24,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957: *Provided*, That with respect to any proposed construction or reconstruction of a timber access road, advisory public hearings shall be held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area of construction or reconstruction with notice and reasonable opportunity for interested persons to present their views as to the practicability and feasibility of such construction or reconstruction: *Provided further*, That hereafter funds available for forest development roads and trails shall also be available for vehicular parking areas: *Provided further*, That the appropriation herein authorized for forest highways shall be apportioned by the Secretary of Commerce for expenditure in the several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, in accordance with the provision of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950.

"SEC. 4. (a) For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas administered by the National Park Service, including areas authorized to be established as national parks and monuments, and national park and monument approach roads authorized by the Act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat. 1053), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$12,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

"(b) For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of parkways, authorized by Acts of Congress, on lands to which title is vested in the United States, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$11,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

"(c) For the construction, improvement, and maintenance of Indian reservation roads and bridges and roads and bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian lands under the provisions of the Act approved May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957: *Provided*, That the location, type, and design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be approved by the Secretary of Commerce before any expenditures are made thereon, and all such construction shall be under the general supervision of the Secretary of Commerce.

"SEC. 5. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 10 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), there

is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the survey, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of main roads through unappropriated or unreserved public lands, nontaxable Indian lands, or other Federal reservations the sum of \$1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, to remain available until expended.

"SEC. 6. Any funds authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, or herein authorized for forest highways, forest development roads and trails, park roads and trails, parkways, Indian roads, and public lands highways shall be immediately available for contract: *Provided*, That any amount remaining unexpended two years after the close of the fiscal year for which authorized shall lapse. The Secretary of the Department charged with the administration of such funds is hereby granted authority to incur obligations, approve projects, and enter into contracts under such authorizations and his action in doing so shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof and such funds shall be deemed to have been expended when so obligated.

"SEC. 7. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 1 of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide for cooperation with Central American Republics in the construction of the Inter-American Highway', approved December 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 860), as amended by section 11 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to the sums heretofore authorized, the sum of \$8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and a like sum for each fiscal year thereafter up to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, to be available until expended, to enable the United States to cooperate with the Governments of the American Republics situated in Central America—that is, with the Governments of the Republics of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama—in the survey and completion of construction of the Inter-American Highway within the borders of the aforesaid Republics, respectively. Not to exceed one-third of the appropriation authorized for each fiscal year may be expended without requiring the country or countries in which such sums may be expended to match any part thereof, if the Secretary of State shall find that the cost of constructing said highway in such country or countries will be beyond their reasonable capacity to bear.

"SEC. 8. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 5 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 158), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State, in addition to the sums heretofore authorized, the sum of \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, to be available until expended, for completing the United States obligation under the applicable agreement with the Republic of Nicaragua: *Provided*, That the survey and construction work authorized by the said section 5 shall be under the general supervision of the Secretary of Commerce.

"SEC. 9. In order to assure that adequate consideration is given to civil defense aspects in the planning and construction of highways constructed or reconstructed with the aid of Federal funds, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to consult, from time to time, with the Federal Civil Defense Administrator relative to the civil defense aspects of highways so constructed or reconstructed.

"SEC. 10. (a) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized in his discretion to engage in research on all phases of highway construction,

reconstruction, modernization, development, design, maintenance, safety, financing, and traffic conditions, including the effect thereon of State laws, and is authorized to test, develop, or assist in the testing and developing of any material, invention, patented article, or process. The Secretary may carry out the authority granted hereby, either independently, or in cooperation with any other branch of the Government, State agency, authority, association, institution, corporation (profit or nonprofit), or any other organization, or person. The funds required to carry out the provisions of this subsection shall be taken out of the administrative and research funds authorized by section 21 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 212), as amended. The provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. sec. 5) shall not be applicable to contracts or agreements made under the authority of this subsection.

"(b) The Secretary shall include in the highway research program herein authorized studies of economic highway geometrics, structures and desirable weight and size standards for vehicles using the public highways and of the feasibility of uniformity in State regulations with respect to such standards, and he shall report from time to time to the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and of the House of Representatives on the progress and findings with respect to such studies.

"Sec. 11. The Secretary of Commerce is hereby directed to make a study in cooperation with the State highway departments and other parties in interest relative to the problems posed by necessary relocation and reconstruction of public utilities services resulting from highway improvements authorized under this Act. Among other things, such a study shall include a review and financial analysis of existing relationships between the State highway departments and affected utilities of all types, and a review of the various State statutes regulating existing relationships, to the end that a full and informative report may be made to the President for transmittal to the Congress of the United States not later than February 1, 1955.

"Sec. 12. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to transmit to the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and of the House of Representatives not later than December 31, 1954, a suggested draft of a bill or bills for a Federal Highway Act, which will include such provisions of existing law, and such changed or new provisions as the Secretary deems advisable. The Secretary shall also submit a report commenting on the draft of bill or bills, which shall include specific reference to each change in, or omission of, any provision of existing law.

"Sec. 13. The Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized and directed to make a comprehensive study of all phases of highway financing, including a study of the costs of completing the several systems of highways in the several States and of the progress and feasibility of toll roads with particular attention to the possible effects of such toll roads upon the Federal-aid highway programs, and coordination thereof, and to make a report of his findings including recommendations with respect to Federal participation in toll roads, to be submitted to the Congress not later than February 1, 1955: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$100,000 from funds available for administrative expenses shall be expended for the purposes of this section.

"Sec. 14. For the purpose of expediting the interstate planning and coordination of a continuous Great River Road and appurtenances thereto traversing the Mississippi Valley from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico in general conformity with the provisions of the Federal Aid Road Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and with the recommended plan set forth in the joint report submitted to the Congress November

28, 1951, by the Secretaries of Commerce and Interior pursuant to the Act of August 24, 1949 (Public Law 262, Eighty-first Congress), there is hereby authorized to be expended by the Secretary of Commerce from general administrative funds not to exceed \$250,000; the amount expended under this section shall be apportioned among the ten States bordering the Mississippi River in proportion to the amount allocated by these respective States for the improvement and extension of existing sections of this highway project as approved by the Secretary of Commerce in cooperation with other public agencies concerned therewith.

"Sec. 15. The term 'highway', as defined in section 2 of the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921 (42 Stat. 212), as amended and supplemented, shall be deemed to include 'tunnels'.

"Sec. 16. The Secretary of Commerce may approve as a part of the Federal-aid secondary system extension through urban areas, connecting points on that system, provided that Federal participation in projects on such extensions shall be limited to urban funds.

"Sec. 17. (a) Highway construction work performed in pursuance of agreements between the Secretary of Commerce and any State highway department which requires approval by the Secretary of Commerce and which is financed in whole or in part by funds authorized under this or succeeding Acts, shall be performed by contract awarded by competitive bidding under such procedures as may by regulations be prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce, unless the Secretary of Commerce shall affirmatively find that, under the circumstances relating to a given project, some other method is in the public interest. All such findings shall be reported promptly in writing to the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

"(b) In any case in which approval by the Secretary of Commerce of any contract for such highway construction work is required, the Secretary shall require as a condition precedent to such approval a sworn statement executed by, or on behalf of, the person, firm, association, or corporation to whom such contract is to be awarded, certifying that such person, firm, association, or corporation has not, either directly or indirectly, entered into any agreement, participated in any collusion, or otherwise taken any action in restraint of free competitive bidding in connection with such contract.

"Sec. 18. Section 1020 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1020. Highway projects

"Whoever, being an officer, agent, or employee of the United States, or of any State or Territory, or whoever, whether a person, association, firm, or corporation, knowingly makes any false statement, false representation, or false report as to the character, quality, quantity, or cost of the material used or to be used, or the quantity or quality of the work performed or to be performed, or the costs thereof in connection with the submission of plans, maps, specifications, contracts, or costs of construction of any highway or related project submitted for approval to the Secretary of Commerce; or

"Whoever knowingly makes any false statement, false representation, false report, or false claim with respect to the character, quality, quantity, or cost of any work performed or to be performed, or materials furnished or to be furnished, in connection with the construction of any highway or related project approved by the Secretary of Commerce; or

"Whoever knowingly makes any false statement or false representation as to a material fact in any statement, certificate, or report submitted pursuant to the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July

11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355) as amended and supplemented.

"Shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

"Sec. 19. All provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838); the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, approved June 29, 1948 (62 Stat. 1105); and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785); and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952, approved June 25, 1952 (66 Stat. 158), not inconsistent with this Act, shall remain in full force and effect.

"Sec. 20. If any section, subsection, or other provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act and the application of such section, subsection, or other provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

"Sec. 21. All Acts or parts of Acts in any way inconsistent with the provisions of this Act are hereby repealed, and this Act shall take effect on its passage.

"Sec. 22. (a) That all Federal-aid road funds heretofore paid on the section of Federal-Aid Primary Route Numbered 39 included in Federal-aid project UI-147 in the State of Connecticut, which section is to be made a part of a highway from the New York State line at Greenwich to the Rhode Island State line at Killingly, planned as an expressway authorized by chapter 107, part IV, General Statutes of Connecticut, 1953 Supplement, shall, prior to the collection of any tolls on said section, be repaid to the Treasurer of the United States, and the amount so repaid shall be deposited to the credit of the appropriation for Federal-aid highways. At the time of such repayment, the project agreement with respect to said Federal-aid project UI-147 shall be canceled. Any amount so repaid, together with the unpaid balance of any amount programmed for expenditure on said project, shall be credited to the unprogrammed balance of Federal-aid road funds of the same class last apportioned to the State of Connecticut. The amount so credited shall be in addition to all other funds than apportioned to said State and shall be available for expenditure in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 212), as now or hereafter amended and supplemented.

"(b) By virtue of the design and plan of said highway in relation to the three sections of Federal-Aid Primary Route Numbered 1 included in Federal-aid projects UI-29, UI-64, and FI-145, which permit unrestricted use of said sections without payment of tolls, it is hereby declared that the incorporation of said sections into said highway will not violate any provision of said Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, or any regulation thereunder. If at any time the highway commissioner of the State of Connecticut shall determine to impose tolls upon or for the use of any one or more of said sections, all Federal-aid road funds theretofore paid or programmed for expenditure on such section or sections upon which tolls are to be imposed, shall be transferred for programming and expenditure in cooperation with the Connecticut State Highway Department pursuant to the provisions of said Federal Highway Act, as now or hereafter amended and supplemented. At the time of such transfer, the project agreement with respect to the project for which the funds are transferred shall be canceled. Upon such cancellation, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to credit the Federal pro rata share of such project agreement to the unprogrammed balance of Federal-aid road funds of the same class last apportioned to the State of Connecticut. The amount so credited shall be in addition to all other

funds then apportioned to said State and shall be available for expenditure in accordance with the provisions of said Federal Highway Act, as now or hereafter amended and supplemented. In lieu of the transfer thereof, the highway commissioner of the State of Connecticut may repay the Federal-aid road funds paid on any such section in the same manner and with the same effect as is provided with respect to the repayment of Federal-aid road funds in subsection (a) of this section.

"(c) Upon the repayment or transfer of Federal-aid road funds, as hereinbefore provided, any such section or sections included in the project with respect to which such repayment or transfer is made, shall become and be free from any and all restrictions contained in said Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, or any regulation thereunder, with respect to the imposition and collection of tolls or other charges thereon or for the use thereof.

"SEC. 23. This Act may be cited as the 'Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

GEO. A. DONDERO,
HOMER D. ANGELL,
J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
GEORGE H. FALLON,
CLIFFORD DAVIS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

EDWARD MARTIN,
FRANCIS CASE,
PRESCOTT BUSH,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
JOHN STENNIS,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8127) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Highway Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to such amendment, namely:

The Senate struck all after the enacting clause of the House bill and inserted in lieu thereof an amendment which was a complete substitute for the text of the House bill. However, the provisions of the House bill and the Senate amendment were substantially similar but the Senate included a number of sections not contained in the House bill. The following statement indicates the differences between the House bill and the Senate amendment and the action of the conferees with respect to these differences.

PRIMARY, SECONDARY, AND PRIMARY ROADS IN URBAN AREAS

Section 1 of the conference agreement authorizes \$700,000,000 for appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1956, and June 30, 1957, on the basis of 45 percent for the Federal-aid primary system, 30 percent for the Federal-aid secondary system, and 25 percent for the Federal-aid urban system, thus authorizing \$315,000,000 for the primary highway system, \$210,000,000 for the secondary highway system, and \$175,000,000 for the primary system in urban areas.

With respect to the foregoing authorizations, the House authorized \$270,000,000 for the primary system, \$180,000,000 for the secondary system, and \$150,000,000 for the primary system in urban areas. The Senate amendment authorized \$342,000,000 for the primary system, \$228,000,000 for the secondary system, and \$190,000,000 for the primary system in urban areas. The conferees

finally compromised and agreed on the amounts now contained in the bill herein reported.

The House conferees prevailed upon the Senate conferees to agree to the provision relative to permission to transfer primary and secondary funds in either direction. This provision was not contained in the Senate amendment and the conferees agreed to the transfer of such funds up to 10 percent instead of up to 25 percent which was contained in the House bill. The conferees also agreed to modifying language which would make such transfer permissible if approved by the governor of the State requesting such transfer as well as with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce. With respect to secondary roads the conferees agreed to an amendment to clarify the language which would assist the Secretary of Commerce in carrying out the purposes of this provision in a manner consistent with the procedures presently in effect.

INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS

Section 2 of the House bill authorized the sum of \$200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, for projects on the interstate highway system. The Senate amendment authorized the sum of \$150,000,000 for identical purposes covering the same period of time. The conferees finally compromised on the sum of \$175,000,000 for each fiscal year.

FOREST HIGHWAYS, FOREST DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

Section 3: The Senate conferees agreed to the authorization of \$22,500,000 for forest highways contained in the House bill. The amount contained in the Senate amendment was \$25,000,000.

With respect to forest development roads and trails, the conferees agreed to the authorization of \$24,000,000 in lieu of \$22,500,000 in the House bill and \$25,000,000 authorized in the Senate amendment.

PARK SERVICE ROADS, PARKWAYS, AND INDIAN ROADS

Section 4: The conferees agreed to the authorization of \$12,500,000 for park roads and trails which amount was contained in the Senate amendment. The House bill authorized \$10,000,000 for this purpose.

The conferees agreed to the authorization of \$11,000,000 for parkways in lieu of \$10,000,000 authorized in the House bill and \$12,500,000 authorized in the Senate amendment.

The conferees agreed to the authorization of \$10,000,000 for Indian roads and trails which was the amount contained in the House bill. The Senate amendment authorized \$12,500,000.

PUBLIC LANDS ROADS

The Senate amendment carried an authorization of \$2,500,000 for public lands roads. There was no such authorization in the House bill. The House conferees accepted this section with the amount reduced to \$1,000,000 per fiscal year.

AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR FEDERAL ROADS

Section 6 provides that any funds authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, or authorized under this bill for forest highways, forest development roads and trails, park roads and trails, Indian roads and public lands highways shall be immediately available for contract. This section was not contained in the House bill, but the House conferees agreed to its inclusion when they prevailed upon the Senate to restrict the provisions to the fiscal years 1955, 1956, and 1957.

INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

Section 7: The Senate amendment provided an authorization of \$40,000,000 to complete

this project to be appropriated in the amount of \$8,000,000 for each of 5 fiscal years ending June 30, 1959. The House bill did not contain such a provision but did provide for the continuation of the authorizations set forth in section 6 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952. The House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment.

RAMA ROAD

Section 8: The Senate amendment provided an authorization of \$2,000,000 for the fiscal years 1955 and 1956. The House bill did not contain such a provision but did provide for the continuation of the authorizations set forth in section 5 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952. The House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment.

CIVIL DEFENSE

Section 9: The Senate amendment authorizes and directs the Secretary of Commerce to consult with the Civil Defense Administrator relative to the civil defense aspects of highways to be constructed or reconstructed. There was no such provision in the House bill. The House conferees agree to the Senate amendment with respect to this section.

GENERAL RESEARCH STUDIES

Section 10 authorizes the Secretary of Commerce in his discretion to engage in research upon all phases of highway construction, reconstruction, modification, development, design, maintenance, safety, financing, and traffic conditions including the effect thereon of State laws and to test, develop, or assist in the testing and development of any material, invention, patented article or process as well as studies of desirable weight size standards for vehicles using the public highways. The funds required to carry out the provisions of this section shall be taken out of administrative research funds. There was no such authorization in the House bill. The House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment with respect to this section.

REVISION OF HIGHWAY LAW

Section 12: This provision directs the Secretary of Commerce to submit to the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, not later than December 1, 1954, a suggested draft of a bill or bills for a Federal highway act which will include such provisions of existing law and such change or new provisions as the Secretary deems advisable. There was no such authorization or direction in the House bill. The House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment with respect to this section.

TOLL ROAD STUDY

Section 13: The Senate amendment carried an authorization and direction to the Commissioner of Public Roads to make a comprehensive study of all phases of highway financing, including a study of costs of completing the several systems of highways in the several States and of the progress and feasibility of toll roads with particular attention to the possible effects of such toll roads upon the Federal-aid highway program and to report to the Congress not later than February 1, 1955. The cost of the study shall not exceed \$100,000 but shall be payable from administrative expenses. The House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment with respect to this section. There was no such authorization in the House bill.

AUTHORIZING PRESIDENT TO ADVANCE EFFECTIVE DATES OF THIS ACT

The Senate amendment provided in section 14 for the President, under certain circumstances, to advance the effective dates of any authorizations except those with respect to the Inter-American Highway and Rama Road if he so determined. There was no such authorization in the House bill. Conferees agreed that this provision be excluded.

GREAT RIVER ROAD

Section 14: The Senate amendment (sec. 15) provided an authorization of not to exceed \$100,000 from administration funds for the purpose of expediting the interstate planning and coordination of a continuous Great River Road, and appurtenances there-to traversing the Mississippi Valley from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico. The House bill provided for like purposes but authorized an amount not to exceed \$250,000 to be expended from administration funds. The Senate conferees agreed to the amendment contained in the House bill.

CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATIONS

Section 17: This provision (sec. 18 of the Senate amendment) provides that highway construction work performed in pursuance of agreements between the Secretary of Commerce and any State highway department which requires approval by the Secretary of Commerce and which is financed in whole or in part by funds authorized under this or succeeding acts shall be performed by contract awarded by competitive bidding under such procedures as may be regulations be prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce, unless he shall affirmatively find that under the circumstances relating to a given project, some other method is in the public interest. Conferees understand that this section does not alter existing procedures with respect to railroad projects involved in the highway program. This section also provides that the Secretary of Commerce, when his approval of any contract is required, shall obtain a sworn statement from the person to whom such contract is to be awarded certifying that such person has not engaged in collusive bidding. The House bill did not contain this section and the House conferees concurred in the Senate amendment.

AMENDMENT OF CRIMINAL CODE

Section 18: This section (sec. 19 of the Senate amendment) was not contained in the House bill and the House conferees concurred in the language contained in the Senate amendment with respect to this section.

DEFENSE ACCESS ROADS

This provision (sec. 20 of the Senate amendment) was not contained in the House bill and the Senate conferees receded.

TOLL ROAD FUNDS

Section 22 (sec. 24 of the Senate amendment) was not contained in the House bill. This provision is intended to enable the State of Connecticut to save approximately \$17,000,000 by incorporating into a proposed expressway four sections of highway upon which Federal-aid funds have been, or are being expended. This would be accomplished by repayment in cash of the Federal-aid funds to the United States and their transfer for use on other projects eligible for Federal aid. There is precedent for this procedure in a law enacted by the 81st Congress to facilitate the construction of the New Jersey Turnpike. The House conferees concurred in the Senate amendment.

There was no disagreement among the conferees on sections 16, 17, 21, 22, 23, and 25 of the Senate amendment (secs. 10, 11, 6, 7, 8, and 13 of the House bill).

GEO. A. DONDERO,
HOMER D. ANGELL,
J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
GEORGE H. FALLON,
CLIFFORD DAVIS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CIVILIAN DEFENSE

(Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 3 minutes.)

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon I had prepared a short speech on the subject of civilian defense, but due to the fact that the House wished to act upon the resolution regarding the death of Senator GRISWOLD, I extended my remarks in the RECORD at that point. I have asked for this time to inform the Members of the House that I introduced a resolution yesterday regarding civilian defense. The resolution asks that the President send a reorganization plan to the Congress which will establish the present Civil Defense Agency as an executive department giving it Cabinet status, also giving to the secretary of that department the right to sit in on the National Security Council's deliberations. My reason for this resolution, and for the asking of this consideration by my colleagues, comes from the heartfelt and very deep conviction that our civilian defense as of now is a completely futile, ineffective, and helpless program. I do not say this in criticism of the people who are struggling with this problem nor of the present Chairman of the Civil Defense Agency. We are faced at this time in this Nation with a problem which we never faced before as a result of the development and probable use of the hydrogen bomb, a bomb which is more powerful and more destructive than all of the TNT ton equivalent bombs dropped in all of World War II with the use of 40,000 bombers in 4 years of time. It, therefore, becomes necessary to reevaluate our military defense methods and our civilian defense methods and to develop as carefully as possible a practical and complete a defense mechanism as we can on the civilian level. It is my hope that if this is given the priority which I believe the Nation's security demands, such a comprehensive and effective plan can and will be worked out. There are certain factors which I believe must be accepted in the working out of such a plan. In the first place, I believe it must be thoroughly integrated with our military plans. This has not been done. Mass movement of military personnel and equipment, and mass population evacuation must be assigned to separate highways. Every city must have a tailored program to fit its peculiar problems. Each city must know, in advance, the estimated number of hours between detection of enemy aircraft and probable arrival. This is a military responsibility and will probably vary with each city's location. It is basic knowledge for specific plans for each city. Many other problems, some of which are part of every city's problems, and some of which are peculiar to certain cities, must be considered. Federal direction and financing, I believe, must be the foundation for any effective overall plan. The Federal direction on fundamental planning is essential for uniformity of results and integration with military responsibilities. Federal financing to a substantial extent is necessary to discharge the obligation of national defense and to spread the cost of defending target areas, over the complete tax structure of the Nation.

On the local level—State, county, city—there will rest the actual burden of detail planning and operation. This is, and will be, a tremendous obligation. Legislation implementing the various participating political subdivisions will undoubtedly be called for.

The peculiar problems of each city will call for the most detailed consideration on the local level, keeping always in mind integration with the Federal responsibilities.

The problem of individual compliance with an accepted and properly authorized Federal-local plan, must be placed on a mandatory basis in the interest of national survival. Voluntary cooperation is not enough, as postwar efforts to enlist civilian defense volunteers have proved.

Local legislation, court and police powers, can enforce compliance if public opinion based on faith in a practical plan is obtained on a favorable basis.

It is because I believe a practical civilian defense plan is just as vital to national survival as an adequate military plan, that I am asking for consideration on the presidential level.

It is because I believe presidential leadership is absolutely necessary if the people are to realize the importance of civilian defense, that I have asked that action be initiated through a presidential reorganization plan.

Not only will such procedure call attention to the importance of the subject, but it will insure speedy action by the Congress, under the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949.

(Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6025. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to grant a license to the Leahi Hospital, a nonprofit institution, to use certain United States property in the city and county of Honolulu, T. H.; and

H. R. 7110. An act to provide that title to certain school lands shall vest in the States under the act of January 25, 1927, notwithstanding any Federal leases which may be outstanding on such lands at the time they are surveyed.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 63. Joint resolution authorizing the District of Columbia to enter into interstate civil-defense compacts.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. JOHNSON of California and to include a speech by Arthur B. Church.

Mr. SCHENCK.

Mr. DAGUE and to include an editorial.

In many cases a large part of the cost is borne by private American and Japanese institutions with United States Government money—usually in yen not otherwise properly available to the United States—playing only a minor role. Where else does so little go so far? During the occupation period when the Army bore primary responsibility for Japanese programs, the volume of exchanges was at least several times greater than during the current year. For example, twenty times as many Japanese leaders were brought to the United States under Government programs in 1951 than in 1954 fiscal.

Now, I want to turn to Korea. Since the end of the occupation period in 1948, there have been only a few scattered exchanges conducted under the Smith-Mundt program. The budget for the current fiscal year provides for 31 exchanges. Under H. R. 8067, of course, this program would be terminated.

There has been no Fulbright program for Korea. Ample Korean won currency is available for this purpose. In 1950 a Fulbright agreement was signed. The outbreak of hostilities, however, precluded the activation of this program. It is difficult to understand the factors which have prevented activation of the program since the termination of hostilities. I am informed that in this instance, the Korean Government has been eager to get going. Yet, in spite of our agreement, the President's request contained no funds for Korea.

It appears that the general budgetary ceilings in the President's call for estimates, which provided for a general holding of the line on appropriation requests, had the effect of preventing the inclusion of funds for the Korean Fulbright program in the 1955 Presidential budget. Since there was no Korean program for 1954, it was reasoned that there could not be one for 1955. Under the ceiling, funds for Korea would have to be taken out of programs for other countries.

I must admit I do not understand the system of priorities that would exclude Korea entirely while providing a large program for the United Kingdom with which we have so many and such fruitful cultural contacts independent of any Government funds. But be that as it may I cannot understand why budgetary ceiling should be applied to foreign currencies not otherwise properly available to the United States. The taxpayer gains nothing and the citizen loses from this wholly unintended byproduct effect of the Rabaut amendment. This amendment, Mr. Speaker, requires, wisely in my opinion, that appropriations be obtained even though foreign currencies will be used in fact. It makes no reference, however, to the application of ceilings on the use of foreign currencies. In my opinion this is an unfortunate example of blind budgeting. H. R. 8067 was not responsible for the omission of Korea from the 1955 Fulbright program.

I know of no country where the educational exchange program is more needed in order to carry out our Far Eastern objectives. I trust that in the

final outcome, funds will be available for Korea. The long lead time required to get these programs underway emphasized the urgency of this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I shall conclude my remarks for the present by summing up the general impact of H. R. 8067 on educational exchanges with the Far East. I concentrate on this area not only because of its vital concern to all Americans at this time, but also because, in the absence of private cultural contacts of normal volume and intensity, there is a special need for Government information and cultural interchange programs directed to the Far East. In view of the country-by-country apportionment contained in the report of the Appropriations Committee accompanying H. R. 8067 as it was presented to the House, there would be no educational exchange programs in Indochina, Formosa, Indonesia, and Korea. In Japan, Burma, Thailand, and the Philippines, the Smith-Mundt program would be eliminated and the Fulbright program reduced because of the inadequacy of dollar support.

Mr. Speaker, we are now in the midst of a great national debate on our policy in regard to the critical situation in Indochina. Running through this debate, there is frequent, and I think appropriate emphasis on the military and political importance of the independence of the Associated States of Indochina. Yet, the plain fact is that there has not been the preparation for independence in Indochina that there was in the Philippines and in India. The Educational Exchange program can play an important part in this preparation. Yet, unless H. R. 8067 is amended in conference or a supplemental appropriation bill is submitted, there will be no further exchanges of this character in Indochina until the fall of 1957 at the earliest.

I shall have more data to present in the near future. At this time I submit for the RECORD two insertions from the Washington Post and Times Herald. The editorial, Wrecking Student Exchange, appeared on April 10, 1954, and Malvina Lindsay's column, entitled "Poor Time To Cut Leader Exchange," appeared on March 18.

WRECKING STUDENT EXCHANGE

The quietest and yet in many ways the most effective aspect of the United States information program has been its international educational exchange service. This has involved the operations of the Smith-Mundt Act and the Fulbright Act under which foreign leaders of thought and opinion, foreign teachers, researchers and students have been brought to this country, while Americans in the same categories have been enabled to go abroad to lecture and to study. This valuable exchange program will be wrecked if the appropriations cuts voted by the House of Representatives are allowed to stand. We hope that the Senate will restore the funds necessary for its continuance when the USIA appropriation comes up for consideration next week.

The House slashed the requested budget from 15 million to 9 million dollars. Since more than \$7 million of this amount is in foreign currency, the action lops off a good three-fourths or more of the dollar funds requested. The result would be elimination

of educational exchanges in 46 countries and of the particularly useful leader program in all countries. It would cut off funds needed to pay the expenses of foreign visitors to the United States; and this, in turn would mean an end to the large supplementary program financed and operated by private agencies in cooperation with the Government. In short, it would write an abrupt finis to the Smith-Mundt Act; and it is hard to see how the Fulbright Act could long survive.

This seems to us to be another instance of pennywise foolishness in the name of economy. The educational exchanges have paid rich dividends in international understanding. They have given an unparalleled opportunity to foreigners of intellectual standing to learn about the United States and then return to tell their fellow-countrymen about America as it really is. And they have enabled Americans studying and teaching abroad to tell the American story and create a good impression of the United States by their demeanor, helpfulness and good will. No amount of propaganda could do so much to counteract the big lie with the big truth.

POOR TIME TO CUT LEADER EXCHANGE

(By Malvina Lindsay)

Just as the Kremlin indicates it may be shifting its cold war strategy more to the ideological side, Congress seems to be engineering a retreat in that very area.

Bringing foreign leaders and teachers to this country for study and travel has been found to be the most direct and effective means of getting American aims and ideas understood abroad. Yet this would be eliminated entirely under the 40-percent cut that the House has voted in the educational exchange service of the overseas information program.

Saturday, Soviet Prime Minister Malenkov, for the first time, said publicly that an atomic war would destroy civilization, not just the capitalistic system, as he has declared in the past. Some Soviet experts believe this forecasts more reliance by the Kremlin, for the time being at least, on other means than force for Communist expansion.

Communists have long practiced the technique of training and using nationals to spread their gospel, especially in primitive regions where there is much suspicion of outsiders. Many observers of American information activities around the world have repeatedly reported that foreign peoples listen best to what their own man says about the United States.

Here are a few examples of how foreign leaders (among 450 from 60 countries), brought here in the last year, multiplied in their native lands the influence of their 3-month visits in the United States:

An Icelandic journalist carried on a one-man campaign throughout his country to explain by articles and talks why American troops should be stationed in Iceland.

A Bangkok lawyer sparked legislation to set up a juvenile court system in Thailand.

An Italian labor leader wrote a book on American labor organization and presented it to 2,000 labor leaders. Another labor leader from Italy became shop steward in a factory whose union had been Communist-dominated.

Nineteen French members of a delegation of NATO journalists wrote 100 articles on the United States, reaching a readership of 2½ million.

An Indian newspaperman wrote back, "I have come from the United States with a fire in my head." He told of touring his country speaking and writing in an effort to make India the citadel of freedom in the East.

An even longer-range influence is being wielded by the 300 teachers from about 50 countries who came here last year for

6-month visits. They included such key persons as: An Indian principal of a teacher-training college; the assistant director of education for the state of Delhi; a Japanese consultant on secondary schools; an Iranian teacher, who on her return revised the curriculum of a secondary school, and who has been explaining America in hundreds of small villages; an Indonesian teacher who with the aid of her husband who constructed the building) established a kindergarten and a training school for kindergarten teachers.

Between 2,300 and 2,400 foreign students, many from countries where the Soviet Union is trying to expand its influence, were brought here last year. (Communist China is reported to have imported 2,000 students from Indonesia alone last year.)

Students chosen for this exchange generally are mature and of outstanding ability. The time lag on their influence at home is greater than that of the leaders, but many of them become the leaders of tomorrow. However, often they too show quick action. A young married couple from Iran, after study at the University of Wisconsin, went home and developed a model village at Tabas for rural education. This has excited interest throughout Iran.

If the Senate sustains the House slash of \$6 million on the \$15 million requested (about the same as was spent last year), student exchange will be restricted entirely to those countries included in the Fulbright exchange scholarship program. This would mean no students could be brought from Iran, Korea, Formosa, Latin America, many other countries.

But it would also be a blow to the Fulbright scholarship program insofar as it affects students coming to this country, since no dollars would be available to help students live here.

Two solid long-range positive answers to Communist expansion have been offered by this country. One is technical assistance, the other the educational exchange. Now there seems a growing tendency to subordinate both to the negative strategy of destruction.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that what I have said this afternoon will encourage many of my colleagues in the House, particularly the distinguished members of the Appropriations Subcommittee on State, Justice, and Commerce, to reexamine the whole matter of the extent of our future educational exchange programs.

POSTAL RATES

(Mrs. ST. GEORGE (at the request of Mr. BROWNSON) asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point.)

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to insert an editorial which appeared recently in the New York World-Telegram, a Scripps-Howard newspaper. The editorial is a very interesting pronouncement on the question of Post Office deficits.

It is a good sign, and a great relief, to see one of our big newspaper chains, who do so much to mold opinion in this country, taking a strong stand against postal deficits, even though these deficits are probably a considerable help to them financially.

The present Postmaster General is waging a gallant fight to take his Department out of the red and it is heartening to see him get the help of the Scripps-

Howard newspapers whose example we trust will be followed by other like-minded publications.

OUT OF THE RED

Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield has laid the cards on the table in the matter of his Department's chronic deficit. He has asked Congress to decide once and for all whether the Post Office Department should pay its own way.

At present postage rates, which were established by Congress, neither Mr. Summerfield nor anyone else could bring the Department out of the red. In fact as the volume of mail increases, the deficit likely would grow larger, since so much mail is carried at a loss.

Mr. Summerfield's proposal of an independent commission which would adjust postage rates automatically to meet changing costs seems especially sound. Political pressure, or the fear of political damage, is the main reason Congressmen are so reluctant to raise postage rates.

This newspaper, like all other publications that go through the mails, profits financially from the fact that its copies are transported for less than it costs the Government to carry them. It is a profit we will gladly forego. We do not want a subsidy which other citizens must pay in taxes.

There is no good reason why the Post Office Department should not pay its own way. Mr. Summerfield's efforts to make it do so are highly commendable and Congress should back him up.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1954

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 8127) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; and I ask unanimous consent that the statement on the part of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House April 13, 1954.)

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The gentleman knows that there is some concern among the highway officials of the State of Wisconsin about this bill as it comes back to us since the Senate has worked its will on it. I wonder if the gentleman will make a statement for the record so far as the seeming objections to the bill are concerned.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman state what the real objection is?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I have discussed the matter with the gentleman

from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] and I believe he knows just what the situation is.

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio to answer the inquiry.

Mr. McGREGOR. I may say to our distinguished friend from Wisconsin that the conferees took into consideration his statement and we are in accord with the views expressed by his highway commissioners. We feel we have the subject covered on page 12 of the report in the following language: "to be prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce, unless he shall affirmatively find that under the circumstances relating to a given project, some other method is in the public interest."

I am sure that procedure will take care of the problem the gentleman from Wisconsin has.

I think it might be in order to mention that other States have similar problems, and it is a matter of working out the mechanics with the 7 or 8 States that do have similar problems.

It might be considered an escape clause. I may say that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Davis] and other Members from Wisconsin called me about it this morning.

Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes; I am glad to have that statement for the record.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I wish to address myself to the gentleman from Ohio, if the gentleman from Michigan will permit.

The question that occurs to me about this is that almost as much work is done on the highways of Wisconsin by the counties on what is known as force account as is done by the States; in other words, the employees of the county do the work and it is not actually let out by contract bidders of any kind. It appears to me that the language of the statement on the part of the managers is directed toward the matter of collusive bidding; in other words, all these contracts must be called to the attention of the Secretary of Commerce to prevent collusive bidding. It seems to me this ought not to be applicable to cases where the work is done by county employees and they are paid by the county. I am asking whether that is definitely tied up to this force account work, whether it is applicable to it.

Mr. McGREGOR. Knowing the gentleman's record I know he would not countenance irregularities in any way, shape, or form. We left the collusion clause in here to take care of contracts and to keep the situation from not being in contradiction of the Federal Highway Act.

I think the gentleman's problem is taken care of in the so-called definition of farm-to-market roads. I think the matter can be handled in generalities.

In the matter of plans, specifications, and operations as far as Wisconsin is concerned, I will say to the gentleman that the Wisconsin highway director would not have to go to the Federal

Roads Administrator and get specific authority for specific work; in other words he can get an overall agreement as to a force account system as far as the secondary and other roads he has mentioned are concerned.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is if there is to be no contract awarded at all it would be a case where they paid the county employees out of their own money and there would not be any problem requiring action by the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. MCGREGOR. The gentleman from Ohio did not mean to leave that impression. Your highway director of Wisconsin can get a general overall agreement with the Commissioner of Public Roads rather than being forced into specific contracts for each particular project. We do not want to interfere with the collusion part of this law where we are making it a Federal offense when anyone is found guilty of collusion in any manner, shape, or form.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. It still goes an extra step not now required. There would have to be approval of the Secretary of Commerce in the form of an affidavit that there was no collusive bidding.

Mr. MCGREGOR. We have asked for a penalty clause in reference to collusion. I am sure the gentleman is in accord with that. We did have to leave a little leeway for instances such as the gentleman has suggested applicable to Wisconsin. For that reason we said "knowingly"; then we have given the opportunity by the escape clause to get permission for the State of Wisconsin to use these funds as it has been using them in the past and will not come under the contract bidding. We have a similar situation, if I may say to the gentleman, relative to overhead crossings, and so forth, where the work is generally done by the railroad companies themselves. There are exemptions made for competitive bidding. I think the same is applicable to the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. On the basis of the gentleman's statement that personally he is familiar with the method that is followed in Wisconsin, and he feels this is reasonably taken care of, I accept.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I think it is taken care of, as I told the gentleman over the phone this morning. I said we were taking care of the situation that exists in Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I took up the gentleman's time here on the floor only because since talking to him on the phone I have had a chance to read the actual language of the report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to enter into the RECORD the following telegrams which I have received from county highway commissioners in my district relative to S. 3184:

Re bill S. 3184, please eliminate the clauses which would prohibit county forces from doing Federal aid secondary highway work. We respectfully ask that you give this your attention.

PIERCE COUNTY HIGHWAY COMMITTEE,
L. J. KAY.
A. C. BJORNSON.
WILLARD COLLETT.

Pepin County Highway Committee definitely objects to language in section 17 of bill S. 3184. Prefer language in section 1.10 A in McGregor bill.

ELWOOD MYERS,
Pepin County Highway Commissioner.
A. C. THRONE,
Chairman of Highway Committee.
RALPH BLAIR,
Secretary, Highway Committee.
ED BOWMAN,
Highway Committee.

We object to the language contained in section 17 of bill S. 3184 and prefer the language contained in the McGregor bill which continues in effect the present Federal requirements as set forth in section 1.10 A.

EARL SKAGEN,
St. Croix County Highway Commissioner.
CARL THOMPSON.

I also received a letter from Mr. A. J. Thelen, executive secretary of the Wisconsin County Boards Association, advising me that—

The counties of Wisconsin are vitally interested in section 17 of the Senate version and feel that the adoption of the Senate version will greatly handicap the use of Federal aid secondary funds in Wisconsin.

Mr. Thelen's letter went on to urge that the conference report retain the present Federal requirements on the use of Federal aid secondary moneys which was what the original McGregor bill did.

Having this expression of views from the authorities of the State of Wisconsin, I relayed this information to Congressman MCGREGOR by phone and letter on Saturday, April 10.

On April 12, I received the following answer from Congressman MCGREGOR:

HON. LESTER JOHNSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JOHNSON: I am today in receipt of your letter of April 10, relative to S. 3184.

I think the bill as reported by the conferees will be in accordance with the suggestion made in the telegram.

Kindest regards,

J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
Member of Congress.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee whether or not this conference report includes the so-called Bush amendment, which would enable the State of Connecticut to save about \$17 million which has been expended for four sections of a contemplated expressway going through the State of Connecticut?

Mr. DONDERO. The report does include that provision, agreed to by both the conferees on the part of the House and the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

(Mr. COUDERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise reluctantly to express my hesitation to support this conference report. I do not suppose anybody uses the roads more

than I do or is any more anxious than I am that we spend all the money necessary to give us the greatest road system in the world to provide an outlet for the millions of cars rolling off the assembly lines in Detroit and elsewhere.

The fact is, the truly significant fact right now is, that we are about to increase the spending authorization for roads to the tune of \$300 million per year.

When we came down here in January we were met by a Presidential budget message indicating that at best we would be confronted in the next fiscal year with a deficit of \$3 billion. Since then we have passed two tax bills that will reduce the income of the Government over a billion dollars, so we are certain of at least a deficit of \$4 billion, if not twice as much.

We are confronted with a bill that for an unlimited number of years will increase from \$575 million to \$875 million the amount to be spent on roads by the Federal Treasury without any provision for the additional money. Of course, it is a necessary amount, you will say, but so are many other things that we do in this House necessary things. This illustrates the difficulty under which we operate and the vice of our system of appropriating and taxing. There is no tie-in between taxing and spending. We pass these bills, we pass these appropriations, and there is no tie-in with the taxation receipts. So, we go from deficit to deficit and from bigger deficits to bigger deficits.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that before we pass any more bills of this sort increasing the long-range obligations of the United States Treasury, that we give serious thought to taking constructive action to compel a balanced budget based upon the receipts of the Treasury from taxes, so that when we spend we will know that the funds are in hand; when we spend we will know that we are not contributing to inflation. I say that this, standing alone, is an inflationary measure. We should go very slowly about it, and in my best judgment we ought to postpone this kind of an increase and every other kind of an increase until we find some way of balancing this budget by making necessary reductions somewhere under some mandatory limitation such as provided in my House bill 2 and House Joint Resolution 20.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. I asked the gentleman to yield in order to associate myself with his remarks. I am with him 100 percent, sir.

Mr. COUDERT. I am delighted that the gentleman is in my corner.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Am I correct in assuming that the House provision for \$250,000, for planning the great Mississippi River highway program from northern Minnesota to the gulf, is a part of this conference report and agreed to by the Senate?

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I will be very happy to answer the gentleman. The House receded and concurred in the Senate amendment in that particular program, and it is part of the legislation.

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. And what is the amount provided for the planning of the Mississippi River highway?

Mr. MCGREGOR. The same as it was when it passed the House, \$250,000.

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time to inquire what disposition the conferees had made of the so-called linkage provision of the bill which was objected to by many Members of the House.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would like to have the privilege of answering that. Since the bill passed the House, the Committee on Ways and Means and this House has extended the one-half cent gasoline tax which makes the linkage provision no longer necessary. The House conferees, in recognition, then, deleted the linkage provision, because the House did extend the gasoline tax until 1955.

Mr. HALE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter I received from the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR], at the point where he was interrogated by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I want to acknowledge the gentleman's inquiry the same as the other gentleman from Wisconsin with reference to this subject matter.

(Mr. DEMPSEY (at the request of Mr. FALLON) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed difficult for me to understand why this honorable body should agree to the adoption of a conference report on H. R. 8127, the Federal-aid highway bill, which reduces by more than \$100 million the money to be made available by our Government in the next biennium for improvement and development of the Nation's roads. I am sure it will be equally difficult for the millions of highway users to understand. In my opinion the Senate has taken a much more realistic view of the Nation's serious highway problem in authorizing \$1,020,000,000 annually in matching funds for the States in fiscal years 1956-57. As a member of the Subcommittee on Roads of the House Public Works Committee, I sought to have the funds authorized

in the House bill increased beyond \$875 million. I submitted an amendment to the House bill which would have provided substantially the amount which the Senate authorized.

It is apparent that the Senate acted in accordance with the highway development policy of the President. In his state-of-the-Union address and again in his speech before the National Safety Council conference the President was emphatic in stating that the Nation's highways must be improved as much and as soon as possible. He pointed to the enormous toll of lives that the highways are taking each year, which reached the alarming total of 38,300 in 1953.

To that can be added the \$3 billion in loss and damage caused by traffic accidents last year. We also must charge the greater proportion of the 200-percent increase in automobile insurance cost in the last 5 years to the deplorable highway situation.

Survey after survey made by the various State highway departments and by the Bureau of Public Roads have provided us with undeniable evidence that our highways are from 15 to 20 years behind the rest of our economic development. They are, without question, the greatest bottleneck today in our march of progress. They are a constant threat to our defense effort and the successful evacuation of our population in the cities in event of an emergency.

The President of the United States recognizes this. Our Department of Defense recognizes it. The people of our Nation are fully aware of it and are deeply concerned because of the failure of Congress, over a period of many years, to do something about it. Apparently the House conferees do not agree with the President or share the people's concern.

For the first time since Federal aid to highways became one of our established policies through congressional action there has been general agreement that the funds derived from the Federal tax on gasoline and diesel fuel should be utilized for highway development. While this is not specifically spelled out in the law and is not a legal obligation it certainly has become a moral obligation that we must recognize. The income from those excises which we have continued at the higher rate is estimated to be in excess of \$1 billion a year. In addition there is excise-tax income in excess of another \$1 billion a year derived from the automobile and associated industries, which the users eventually pay. This makes a total of more than \$2 billion derived from highway use. Most certainly the return of one-half of that money to highway development is justified.

This bill does not become effective until July 1, 1955. The provision which would have given the President authority to advance its effective date if circumstances should justify such action has been eliminated. This means that there will be \$500 million in gasoline tax collected in excess of the present Federal-aid highway authorization between now and that date. It also means that the development of our highways will continue to be retarded for another year.

Unless we take some action during this session to provide additional funds for the 1955 fiscal year there will be increased deterioration of our highway system that will offset in a great degree the additional funds we are providing for fiscal years 1956-57. The massacre on our highways will continue unabated. In view of the fact that the conference report eliminates a total in excess of \$100 million from the provisions of the Senate bill it would be entirely consistent and in the public interest for us to enact legislation making immediately available additional funds for the development of the interstate highway system which is also our defense highway network. Both the chairman of the House Public Works Committee and I have bills in that committee authorizing additional funds for the interstate highways. I am confident that the President would approve such legislation. It not only will expedite the highway-development program about which we have been so remiss but it would provide employment for many workers at a time when those jobs would be most beneficial to the Nation's economy. A Congress which has been more than generous in appropriating billions for assistance to the people of other nations most certainly can be considered inconsistent if it fails to recognize its obligation to our own citizens. We are not recognizing that obligation when we refuse to make funds available that are necessary to the proper development of our Nation's roads.

The time for words is passed. They do not build roads. Only money can do that. The longer we delay in providing adequate funds the more money it will cost. We should act now to make those funds available.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COUDERT) there were—ayes 134, noes 9.

So the conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORRECTION IN ENROLLMENT OF H. R. 8127

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a House concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 225) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 8127) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, the Clerk of the House is authorized and directed to make the following correction:

In section 13 of the bill strike out "The Commissioner of Public Roads" and insert in lieu thereof "The Secretary of Commerce."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAN-AMERICAN DAY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the resolution providing that the House of Representatives designate Wednesday, April 14, 1954, as a day in celebration of Pan-American Day, on which day remarks appropriate to such occasion may occur, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 511.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas April 14, 1954, will mark the 64th anniversary of the founding of the Pan-American Union, now the Secretariat of the Organization of American States; and

Whereas the legislatures of the 21 American Republics have traditionally observed April 14 as Pan-American Day; and

Whereas the House of Representatives, ever since the founding of the Pan-American Union, has encouraged the development of inter-American cooperation and friendship in recognition of common interests and aspirations of the peoples of this hemisphere; and

Whereas inter-American cooperation, understanding, and friendship are essential for the maintenance of independence, peace, and security of all our peoples; and

Whereas at the 10th Inter-American Conference held at Caracas in March 1954, the American Republics reaffirmed their intention to strengthen all forms of mutual cooperation and adopted a declaration of solidarity for the preservation of the political integrity of the American States against international Communist intervention; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives extend to the representative bodies of each of the American Republics on the occasion of Pan-American Day its cordial greetings and its profound desire to continue its efforts toward inter-American cooperation and solidarity in the mutual interests of the 21 American Republics.

Copies of the present resolution shall be distributed through appropriate channels to the legislatures of the other American Republics and to the Secretary General of the Organization of American States.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, inter-American friendship, and the inter-American system which it has engendered, are constant factors in the development and the security of our own country and of the neighbor nations. It is no once-a-year phenomenon, waking every April 14 only to go to sleep until the same date in the following year. It is not a recurrent appearance, but a continual presence, which the American Republics commemorate, and for which they give thanks on Pan-American Day each year.

The basis of inter-American cooperation is the mutual belief of the nations of this hemisphere that they share common fundamental interests unique to this hemisphere. The Organization of American States, made up of our 21 Republics, is therefore a regional organ-

ization, which devotes its full energies to the furtherance of those interests.

The Inter-American Conference, meeting every 5 years in successive capitals, is the highest body of the Organization of American States. There we take counsel together on our mutual problems. The Tenth Inter-American Conference, held last month at Caracas, Venezuela, reaffirmed our faith in freedom, our solidarity as free peoples, and our determination in that faith and that solidarity to withstand any intervention by international communism. It reaffirmed also the integrity of the purposes, and the cordiality of the mutual bond of friendship uniting the American peoples.

Pan-American Day is an expression of Hemisphere good will. More important even than its official recognition as such by our 21 governments is its wide observance in spontaneous and various ways by our 21 peoples. School children; labor groups; women's clubs; religious, commercial, and professional organizations; all of these and many others, on this day every year, in steadily increasing numbers, hold inter-American programs, and thus add to the spirit of good will throughout the Americas.

The United States has the proud primacy of being first of the American Republics to become independent, and we can be deeply, justly proud of the fact that the sister Republics of this hemisphere, as they attained their own independence one after another, patterned their national constitutions on the Constitution of the United States.

These fundamental and vitally important common factors have brought about a solidarity, rare indeed in international relationships, which has manifested itself in this hemisphere for well over a century. Inter-American solidarity is in fact an accepted policy of the American nations, but it has never been a narrow partisan policy, neither in our own country nor in the neighboring Republics. It is something in which our peoples believe, and because this is true—and is a continuing truth—to which our Governments respond. In the history of the hemisphere, there have been interruptions in good relations from time to time, brought about by errors of judgment, or errors of misunderstanding on one part or the other. But my point is that these have been the temporary, the passing, aspects of a relationship, long established, thriving, and basically sound. For let us never forget that what the American Republics cherish in common is basic: all our peoples believe in the dignity and sanctity of the individual and in the responsibility of the state; all believe in freedom, and know that freedom is soundest and strongest—is most truly free—when it is freedom under law.

Our peoples believe, too, in the vitality of good will. They realize that friendship is a tremendous asset between nations as it is between individuals. On Pan-American Day it is heartening to recall the innumerable interchanges with sister Republics of this hemisphere which uphold and develop further understanding and friendship through both

private enterprise and official agencies. The thousands of students who come from Latin America to study in our own colleges and universities; the professors from our schools who go to teach in theirs and the professors who come from them to us; the manifold interchanges of information, skills, and techniques for mutual benefit: these contribute in large degree. And so does each individual citizen contribute who makes a Pan-American Day resolution to become better acquainted with our neighbors in this hemisphere.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, today in this prevailing atmosphere of cordiality and good will we are hearing many aspects of inter-American relations evaluated. It is not a new atmosphere for us Ohioans. Ohio for a long time past has been active in contributing toward better mutual understanding among the American Republics. We have encouraged the exchange of students and other cultural interchanges as carried on both officially and through private enterprise. We have welcomed exhibits showing the artistic and technical progress of the other American Republics, and have reciprocated by helping acquaint them with the achievements of our own State and Nation. We have encouraged language-teaching in our schools. I can claim for Ohio an advanced post in the friendly campaign to increase hemisphere solidarity.

I, myself, as chairman of the Roads Committee, have had the privilege of working for a literal and very practical means of bringing the American peoples closer together—the Inter-American Highway and the Rama Road.

However, on this Pan-American Day I wish particularly to call attention to one common interest of ours and our Latin American neighbors, the importance of which we may not appreciate as much as we should. I am referring to what we have long and wisely regarded as our national game, baseball. In a book published last month, *God's Country and Mine*, Prof. Jacques Barzun, of Columbia University, a naturalized citizen of this country born in France, points out that baseball is a real demonstration of some of the American virtues. In it, he says, we have "accuracy and speed, the practiced eye and hefty arm, the mind to take in and readjust to the unexpected, the possession of more than one talent, and the willingness to work in harness without special orders." Those are virtues that not only win ball games but win respect and cooperation in national and international affairs as well. Our friends and neighbors in the other American Republics, like us, are learning to esteem these characteristics on the baseball diamond as well as at the international conference table; and, also like us, they are discovering that the virtues practiced in the field of sports are no less praiseworthy and reliable at international sessions.

Latin-American interest in baseball is lively, and always on the increase. Practically the whole of our own vocabulary for the game has been taken over enthusiastically in the other American Republics; with the pronunciation left approximately the same, and only the spelling undergoing a sea-change. The word "baseball" itself, for instance, sounds pretty much the same in Spanish, but it is spelled "beisbol"; and "home run" while pronounced "hone ron"—which is understandable—comes out in print as "jonron." However, as every lover of our national game knows, these are incidental considerations. The really important point is this: Does the Latin American fan shout as wildly, leap as high, suffer as agonizingly and exult as blissfully when his favorite goes to bat as our own fans do? The answer is "Yes." He does indeed. And he expresses all this in his own dramatically intense language. Gentlemen, he is undoubtedly a brother.

A mutual interest so genuinely shared is always a means toward friendship and understanding. I have learned that United States businessmen resident in Latin America have helped our good relations by their recognition of this fact. For instance, such a group at Caracas, Venezuela, has sent two outstanding Venezuelan amateur ballplayers to the United States to see several big league games. American baseball clubs cooperated in making their visit to New York, Washington, and Florida a memorable success which—according to our Embassy at Caracas—received more favorable publicity in the Venezuelan press than any other United States-Venezuelan news story of the year. From time to time our big league players have also helped good relations by presenting to some Latin American amateur clubs such equipment as bats, balls, and mitts autographed by famous United States baseball players, and treasured as relics of lasting value.

Baseball was an important feature of the seventh Central American and Caribbean Games held last month in Mexico, with 1,400 athletes from 13 countries participating in the new \$3 million track and field stadium.

A number of good ballplayers from Latin America—Cuba, Venezuela, Mexico, and other countries—are giving a fine account of themselves on some of our own major teams. The Inter-American Federation of Amateur Baseball is also contributing to the ever-increasing popularity of the game in other American republics. In some countries, it is reported that eager fans take their lunch to the baseball parks in the morning and sit through 3 or 4 games a day. Winter leagues in several of the southern republics also keep public interest at high pitch. Every day we may be sure that home runs are knocked out of the park or into the bleachers in some dozen neighboring republics. So far it is true, this great popularity of baseball is found mostly in Mexico, Central America, and the Caribbean region in general. Happily, it is spreading southward. Let us hope on some not far-off Pan-American

Day that we may announce that baseball extends from Arctic to Antarctic.

One of the best proofs of the international importance of baseball is the Soviet claim of having invented it. You may recall that the Moscow radio not so long ago broadcast to an astonished world the news that baseball was just another Russian invention. I doubt whether anybody in Latin America believed them. The fact is, I think, that we are in on the ground floor as regards baseball in Latin America. Our good friends in the other republics know that baseball comes from us, and that it comes with a warm fellow feeling of goodwill. I am glad to take the opportunity of Pan-American Day to express my own conviction that the more we cheer together from the bleachers, the better and the happier will be our relationship at the conference table.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, one truth comes home to us every Pan-American Day when we fix our special attention on the cordial relationship among the peoples of this hemisphere. And that is the inevitability of inter-American cooperation. There is no substitute for that cooperation, and there is no alternative. The Republics of this hemisphere are free and interdependent, and each quality is strengthened by the other.

The Organization of American States, in which our 21 nations are equal partners, has been the natural consequence of the historical progression of inter-American relations. It derives in the first instance from the dream of the Liberator, Simón Bolívar; but it owes in great degree its actual realization to the farsighted policy of one of our own great Secretaries of State, James G. Blaine, and its efficient functioning to the enlightened planning of another, Elihu Root.

The great difference between our inter-American system and the international organizations that preceded it in history, ancient and modern, is that the inter-American system was created in peace, founded in peace, and has as its objective, peace. One of its most notable achievements has been the development of the machinery for the peaceful solution of controversy between the member States.

While peace is their ideal, the ideal of the inter-American system is expressed as a determination never to yield up freedom. Vigorous expression of this ideal was given a few weeks ago at the 10th Inter-American Conference. There, in the words of Secretary Dulles, the Conference "made history by adopting with only one negative vote a declaration that if the international communism movement came to dominate or control the political institutions of any American State that would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of all the American states and would endanger the peace of America."

In the economic field, the Conference adopted a resolution designed to encourage private foreign investments. In the field of cultural exchange, the Conference endorsed a declaration on cultural cooperation stressing the importance of the eradication of illiteracy in the Americas; and it approved measures for facilitating exchange of teachers and students. The Conference emphasized the great part already taken by private initiative in furthering inter-American progress, and recommended the extension of such public-spirited work.

While these are only a few of the highlights of the 10th Conference, it is well worth our while to observe how consistently, after 65 years, inter-American meetings keep to the course originally marked out for our intrahemisphere activities. I should like to close by quoting the words of James G. Blaine, then Secretary of State, in his opening address before the First Inter-American Conference, held at Washington in October 1889. Mr. Blaine described that gathering and its noble purposes as follows:

An honorable, peaceful conference of 17 independent American powers, in which all shall meet together on terms of absolute equality; a conference in which there can be no attempt to coerce a single delegate against his own conception of the interests of his nation * * * which will seek nothing, purpose nothing, endure nothing that is not in the general sense of all the delegates timely, wise, and peaceful.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, as one who previous to World War II went to South America for the purpose of bringing forcibly to the attention of our neighbors to the south our intention to preserve the security of the Western Hemisphere and of solidifying all the countries on these continents; and who met intimately with the presidents and leaders of every nation and on the floor of their chambers addressed seven of their congresses, I want to commend the gentleman for his devotion to the friendly union of the people of North and South America and for bringing to the floor of the House this resolution recognizing Pan American Day.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, today is Pan-American Day. In the Congress of the United States, through the press and radio media, by appropriate ceremonies before the statues of Bolívar, Artigas, San Martín, and the other liberators, and by observances in our educational institutions, the importance and the significance of the pan-American ideal is honored. All this is to the good. But it is not enough. I should like to offer a few remarks about the Inter-American system and to explain why mere ob-

again. I am convinced that nowhere else do we get such large returns on so small an investment.

Let me mention a few examples. In January of this year, our South Dakota newspapers carried many news stories about Miss Maria Lisboa, an exchange teacher from Brazil. Miss Lisboa is one of the many foreign teachers who have come to this country as trainees under the Smith-Mundt Act, and who carry back to their own pupils a firsthand knowledge of our country and our way of life.

She said:

My ideas of the United States have been changed since arriving here. Perhaps the most delightful correction in my impressions is the fact that you are a religious people. I was surprised, too, in finding that you take such a keen interest in worthwhile organizations and clubs, and are ever striving to benefit your fellow man. In Brazil and in the United States we all want freedom, homes, and to live in peace. This truth I will carry back to my people and to my government. Certainly I will now be a good ambassador for your country.

Certainly she will. And no less certainly the others who benefit from our programs of educational exchange will likewise be good ambassadors. Our citizens whom we send to Latin America, Latin Americans who come to us, once they are home again, continue a two-way embassy which is beneficial to us both.

Another excellent example of this is Hilton Hanna, a young colored man, a labor specialist, who visited a number of the neighboring Republics last year under sponsorship of the Department of State. Labor groups in all the countries visited showed the greatest eagerness to learn more about the labor movement in the United States. He talked with labor leaders and with the rank and file; he was in his own person an answer to charges that our Negro citizens are oppressed and browbeaten. When Communists on various occasions made him the target of violent criticisms of our country he answered them straightforwardly with the facts about the opportunities and the rewards of the workingman in the United States. There can be no doubt that his trip paid off in understanding and good will. Nevertheless, it also showed how much still remains to be done.

Mr. Hanna says:

I came back convinced that we, the people of the United States, have many friends among our neighbors south of the border. In fact, the majority of the people are definitely pro-United States of America. However, those who are anti-United States of America are working overtime in order to poison the minds of our friends and win them away from us.

Let me cite another instance of benefits which our country derives from its exchange-of-persons program. In 1953 Chief Justice Luis Antonio Eguiguren, of Peru, was our Government's guest on a visit which made him acquainted with our Congress, our Supreme Court, and many national leaders in and out of Government. The invitation had been extended to him at the suggestion of emi-

nent United States jurists, and he proved to be a deeply interested and receptive guest. When he returned to Peru he said, in a press interview at Lima:

The United States is a country which has faced up to its own serious problems as well as to all the others which it meets by virtue of its moral leadership in the world today. * * * Justice there remains young and dynamic. * * * The United States has become the center of the efforts and aspirations for the betterment of humanity. It is impossible to convey an exact idea of the labors of the United States in the cause of peace and justice: they are immense.

Let us never delude ourselves into believing that we alone recognize the rich dividends that are paid by such exchanges as these. We may be certain that not only our friends but our adversaries are skilled in making use of so invaluable an instrument. In this, as in other fields, we have the advantage of priority; of having been there first with the most. But if we waive our advantage, if we let our exchange program dwindle and weaken, we shall find how ably these adversaries will work in order to limit the scope of freedom and cut the ground from under its feet. Suppose we glance for a moment at that side of the picture. In 1953 1,000 Latin Americans, many of them young people of both sexes, visited the Soviet bloc under auspices of international communism. That was twice the number of such visits in 1952; 10 times the number in 1950. Obviously, the Soviet cultural program attaches great importance to the exchange of persons. It is especially concerned with the visits of delegations of leaders from Latin American trade unionists, youth groups, businessmen, authors, artists, scientists. When they arrive in the Soviet Union, the red carpet is unrolled. They are shown the best—and only the best—of Soviet life and cultural activities. The Soviet program also includes the sending of Soviet artists, writers, scientists, and athletes to the other American Republics in order, as they modestly express it, "to enrich the national culture of foreign countries." Such emissaries to Latin America have included during recent months Soviet athletes who participated in the Pentathlon games in Chile, trade union representatives who visited Cuba, Mexico, Panama, and other American Republics; "friendship delegations" to Brazil; a cultural delegation of 14 Soviet authors, artists, and scientists to Argentina.

It is unfortunate that no overall statistics are available on the Soviet program for exchange of persons. However, the information obtainable is sufficient to prove the magnitude of the program, and to show that it receives the wholehearted support of the Communist regime. We know that that regime is hardheaded and hardfisted, and that it is not carrying on these exchanges merely to make life more agreeable and more decorative. Furthermore, we know that there is no sign of any intention to reduce the scope of the Soviet exchange of persons program. Quite the contrary. It is growing bigger and bigger.

So there we have it from both angles. Our program of cultural interchange with the other American Republics is vitally important because we must maintain and strengthen the friendship that is an essential element of the solidarity which is our security, and theirs. In such times as these, friendship is not expendable. On the other hand, we must intensify and enlarge our relationships of understanding and good will with the other American Republics, insofar as we can, in order to counteract the astute, the widespread, and, unhappily, the increasingly productive program of international Communist propaganda, so much of which is aimed with deadly intention straight at the heart of America.

We need not be discouraged. All we need is to keep our eyes open and our wits about us. One hundred and thirty-one years ago, in 1823, one of the ablest and greatest of our Secretaries of State, John Quincy Adams, was well informed about Latin American resistance to Russian blandishments. On July 22 of that year he wrote to Henry Middleton, the United States Minister to Russia:

There can, perhaps, be no better time for saying, frankly and explicitly, to the Russian Government, that the future peace of the world, and the interest of Russia herself, cannot be promoted by Russian settlement upon any part of the American continent. * * * The new American Republics will be as impatient of a Russian neighbor as the United States.

We know that inter-American solidarity is essential to a free hemisphere, a free world. We know that such solidarity has been achieved through generations of friendship built up by all the innumerable interchanges, public and private, official and unofficial, that have brought our countries to a basis of understanding and inspired them with the will to work together for the common good. Let us not permit so valuable a treasure to slip from our possession, nor to be diverted into the covetous hands of the enemies of freedom.

It seems to me that this day, Pan-American Day, 1954, is a good time for the Members of the Senate and our colleagues in the House to rededicate ourselves to the effort to secure adequate funds, adequate leadership, and adequate legislation with which to enable the programs for an interchange of ideas and of individuals to continue on a reasonable and a sufficient basis. I hope that as we rededicate ourselves to pan-American friendship, we shall also rededicate ourselves to the work of supplying the tools which tend to make these friendships lasting and understanding.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEALL in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ANNIVERSARY OF DEATH OF FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, April 12 marked the ninth anniversary of the death of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. I had expected to make some remarks in commemoration of that sad event, but because of the untimely death of our colleague, Senator Griswold, I was prevented from doing so.

I now ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD a statement which I prepared for delivery on last Monday, April 12.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

On April 12, 9 years ago the hearts of countless millions of people throughout the world were saddened at the news of the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Those who loved him—and they were legion—knew that this loss would be felt throughout the earth wherever freedom dwelt in the hearts of men.

Much has been said about what his passing meant to those to whom he symbolized the leadership of the democratic cause. But I loved him also—to quote a famous American—"for the enemies he made." Indeed, his main adversaries abroad—Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo—may have survived him in this life by a few weeks or months, but each of them saw, before their deaths, the complete crumbling of the evil empires against which Franklin Roosevelt had led the forces of opposition.

And here at home, Franklin Roosevelt was certainly not without enemies, men who hated and feared him. This great leader who so courageously and patriotically charted a bold course to recovery, reform and victory did not, of course, please everyone. The needs of his people, when he assumed the presidency in 1933, were so vast, so compelling, so immediate and so desperate that to have attempted less than he did, in response to his country's needs, would have meant failure. And failure in those days could have resulted in economic, political, yes and even civil, collapse.

But we know that Franklin Roosevelt did not shrink from bold steps, where he felt they were necessary. Nor did he lack courage in meeting his responsibilities on the world scene. But for his boldness, for his courage and for his vision, he became the object of bitter hatred, even from some who benefited greatly from his leadership. This is nothing new in history.

What is disturbing today, however, has been the continuing effort of some who hated him to rewrite the history of his time for the purpose of dulling the brightness of his fame as the beloved champion of the democratic spirit. In death he has been called weak, vacillating and compromising; he has been charged with dictatorial purposes and a stubborn blindness to error. He has been indicted for his gift of improvisation which has been called expediency and for his love of peace which has been called appeasement. The dark shadow of complicity with treason, has been raised in an effort to cast it over the bright sun of his greatness.

To paraphrase Shakespeare in reference to another mighty figure of history—the mistakes that men make live after them; the great good they do is often interred with their bones.

In the case of Franklin Roosevelt, the efforts of his detractors will, in the end, prove as vain in his absence as they proved while he was alive. He was of that rare breed of men who are called unconquerable.

His own spirit was unconquerable. His achievements were unconquerable. His enemies will no more succeed in blackening his name in death than they succeeded in vanquishing him while he was alive.

The love which mankind bore him will endure as long as the history of this country is told and remembered.

The monumental deeds he accomplished are built ineradicably into the institutions of America. The muck-rakers of today may assail him, but the hold he had on the people in his lifetime is, I believe, unshakable even today.

I loved him as a man, as well as for his leadership. I was privileged to work closely with him and to be regarded as a member of his inner circle. I differed with him on some things, and opposed him when I thought he was in error.

But as long as I live, I shall not cease to be proud of whatever contribution I was able to make to his success, to his accomplishments, to his leadership.

I am sad in remembering his untimely passing. But I am glad in recalling the fact that he was spared for so long to lead his country and all freemen everywhere in the eternal struggle against tyranny, oppression, and injustice.

CONSTRUCTION OF HIGHWAYS— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8127) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, in Thirty-ninth United States Statutes at Large,

page 355, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of April 13, 1954.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have a brief explanation of the report?

Mr. MARTIN. The authorizations agreed upon by the conferees represents a good compromise between the bills adopted by the two respective Houses. Briefly the conference report provides for a total of \$966 million per year for each of the fiscal years 1956 and 1957. This compares with the original figures of \$875 million passed by the House and \$1,010,000,000 passed by the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a comparative list showing the authorization amounts as passed by the House and as passed by the Senate, and as agreed upon in conference.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparative data on highway bills for fiscal years 1956 and 1957

Types	H. R. 8127 as passed House	H. R. 8127 as passed by Senate	Conference amounts
Federal-aid systems:			
Primary.....	\$270,000,000	\$342,000,000	\$315,000,000
Secondary.....	180,000,000	225,000,000	210,000,000
Urban.....	150,000,000	190,000,000	175,000,000
Subtotal.....	600,000,000	760,000,000	700,000,000
Interstate system.....	200,000,000	150,000,000	175,000,000
Total Federal-aid systems.....	800,000,000	910,000,000	875,000,000
Federally built roads on or to Federally owned or controlled lands:			
Forest highways.....	22,500,000	25,000,000	22,500,000
Forest roads and trails.....	22,500,000	25,000,000	24,000,000
Park roads and trails.....	10,000,000	12,500,000	12,500,000
Parkways.....	10,000,000	12,500,000	11,000,000
Indian roads.....	10,000,000	12,500,000	10,000,000
Public lands.....	0	2,500,000	1,000,000
Total.....	75,000,000	90,000,000	81,000,000
Inter-American Highway.....		8,000,000	8,000,000
Rama Road.....		2,000,000	2,000,000
Totals for each fiscal year.....	875,000,000	1,010,000,000	966,000,000
Defense access roads.....		10,000,000	

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand that the conference report makes a reduction of \$50 million. The total is \$460 million now, and it was \$510 million, was it not?

Mr. MARTIN. There is a reduction of \$46 million.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is a \$46 million reduction. While I am personally disappointed that the conference report did not provide for the full amount as passed by the Senate, I know from conversations I have had with the Senator

from Pennsylvania personally, that the conferees did everything they could to have the bill agreed to as it went from the Senate floor, which I think was a better bill than the one we are now asked to accept. I know that this is the best highway bill ever approved by Congress, because it provides more money than ever before. It provides for at least the amount which should be received from the 2-cent gasoline tax, which revenue has previously been diverted to other costs of Government rather than going to highways. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. MARTIN. That is correct.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania advise the Senate from which of the several authorization items the \$46 million was taken?

Mr. MARTIN. I might say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that for the primary system, as shown by the table I have asked to have printed in the RECORD, the House authorized \$270 million, the Senate \$342 million, and the conference compromised on a figure of \$315 million.

For the secondary roads the House authorized \$180 million, the Senate \$228 million, and the conference compromised on a figure of \$210 million.

With regard to urban roads, the House authorized \$150 million, the Senate \$190 million, and the conference compromised on a figure of \$175 million. That made a compromise total for the Federal aid system of \$700 million. The Senate bill had authorized a total of \$760 million, and the House a total of \$600 million.

With regard to the interstate system, the House authorized \$200 million, the Senate \$150 million, and the conference resulted in a compromise on \$175 million.

The total, as compromised by the conference, amounted to \$875 million. The House had authorized a total of \$800 million, and the Senate a total of \$910 million.

Does the Senator desire that I enumerate the amounts authorized by the

House, the Senate, and the compromise amounts arrived at by the conference, for the federally built roads on or to federally owned or controlled lands?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon will be satisfied to study the list which the Senator from Pennsylvania is placing in the RECORD, rather than request that the RECORD be burdened with further figures at this time.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a tabulation showing the State breakdown of the approximate apportionment of Federal-aid highways funds as agreed upon by the conference.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Approximate apportionment of Federal-aid highway funds pursuant to the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954

State	Federal aid				Interstate			Total (\$875,000,000)
	Primary (\$315,000,000)	Secondary (\$210,000,000)	Urban (\$175,000,000)	Snbtotal (\$700,000,000)	(\$87,500,000) population ¹	(\$87,500,000) sec. 21 ²	Snbtotal (\$175,000,000)	
Alabama.....	\$6,722,000	\$5,209,000	\$2,261,000	\$14,192,000	\$1,642,000	\$1,886,000	\$3,528,000	\$17,720,000
Arizona.....	4,711,000	3,208,000	671,000	8,590,000	643,000	1,319,000	1,962,000	10,552,000
Arkansas.....	5,244,000	4,197,000	965,000	10,406,000	1,024,000	1,470,000	2,494,000	12,900,000
California.....	14,459,000	7,444,000	15,339,000	37,242,000	5,676,000	4,070,000	9,746,000	46,988,000
Colorado.....	5,668,000	3,786,000	1,434,000	10,888,000	711,000	1,588,000	2,299,000	13,187,000
Connecticut.....	2,042,000	1,029,000	3,342,000	6,413,000	1,076,000	576,000	1,652,000	8,065,000
Delaware.....	1,543,000	1,029,000	354,000	2,926,000	643,000	429,000	1,072,000	3,998,000
Florida.....	5,117,000	3,345,000	3,094,000	11,556,000	1,486,000	1,437,000	2,923,000	14,479,000
Georgia.....	7,796,000	5,954,000	2,515,000	16,265,000	1,847,000	2,187,000	4,034,000	20,299,000
Idaho.....	3,883,000	2,731,000	332,000	6,946,000	643,000	1,087,000	1,730,000	8,676,000
Illinois.....	12,135,000	6,608,000	12,068,000	30,811,000	4,671,000	3,414,000	8,085,000	38,896,000
Indiana.....	7,477,000	5,154,000	4,128,000	16,759,000	2,109,000	2,099,000	4,208,000	20,967,000
Iowa.....	7,607,000	5,567,000	2,049,000	15,223,000	1,405,000	2,132,000	3,537,000	18,760,000
Kansas.....	7,645,000	5,352,000	1,622,000	14,619,000	1,022,000	2,140,000	3,162,000	17,781,000
Kentucky.....	5,806,000	4,820,000	1,792,000	12,418,000	1,579,000	1,630,000	3,209,000	15,627,000
Louisiana.....	4,908,000	3,553,000	2,529,000	10,990,000	1,439,000	1,379,000	2,818,000	13,808,000
Maine.....	2,643,000	1,891,000	721,000	5,255,000	643,000	741,000	1,384,000	6,639,000
Maryland.....	2,769,000	1,693,000	2,929,000	7,391,000	1,256,000	780,000	2,036,000	9,427,000
Massachusetts.....	4,001,000	1,486,000	7,182,000	12,669,000	2,515,000	1,131,000	3,646,000	16,315,000
Michigan.....	9,776,000	5,965,000	8,031,000	23,772,000	3,416,000	2,748,000	6,164,000	29,936,000
Minnesota.....	8,169,000	5,767,000	2,810,000	16,746,000	1,599,000	2,290,000	3,889,000	20,635,000
Mississippi.....	5,631,000	4,691,000	1,955,000	11,277,000	1,168,000	1,579,000	2,747,000	14,024,000
Missouri.....	9,181,000	6,212,000	4,250,000	19,643,000	2,120,000	2,575,000	4,695,000	24,338,000
Montana.....	6,326,000	4,352,000	406,000	11,084,000	643,000	1,770,000	2,413,000	13,497,000
Nebraska.....	6,142,000	4,355,000	1,012,000	11,509,000	711,000	1,719,000	2,430,000	13,939,000
Nevada.....	4,067,000	2,718,000	131,000	6,916,000	643,000	1,137,000	1,780,000	8,696,000
New Hampshire.....	1,543,000	1,029,000	511,000	3,083,000	643,000	429,000	1,072,000	4,155,000
New Jersey.....	4,073,000	1,370,000	7,554,000	12,997,000	2,593,000	1,151,000	3,744,000	16,741,000
New Mexico.....	5,121,000	3,518,000	566,000	9,205,000	643,000	1,433,000	2,076,000	11,281,000
New York.....	14,806,000	5,933,000	23,064,000	43,803,000	7,952,000	4,178,000	12,130,000	55,933,000
North Carolina.....	7,805,000	6,667,000	2,217,000	16,689,000	2,178,000	2,191,000	4,369,000	21,058,000
North Dakota.....	4,570,000	3,318,000	292,000	8,180,000	643,000	1,278,000	1,921,000	10,101,000
Ohio.....	10,984,000	6,681,000	9,985,000	27,650,000	4,261,000	3,090,000	7,351,000	35,001,000
Oklahoma.....	6,741,000	4,827,000	1,885,000	13,453,000	1,197,000	1,889,000	3,086,000	16,539,000
Oregon.....	5,385,000	3,763,000	1,384,000	10,532,000	816,000	1,509,000	2,325,000	12,857,000
Pennsylvania.....	12,363,000	7,357,000	13,063,000	32,783,000	5,629,000	3,483,000	9,112,000	41,895,000
Rhode Island.....	1,543,000	1,029,000	1,234,000	3,806,000	643,000	429,000	1,072,000	4,878,000
South Carolina.....	4,241,000	3,512,000	1,187,000	8,940,000	1,135,000	1,191,000	2,326,000	11,266,000
South Dakota.....	4,920,000	3,514,000	335,000	8,769,000	643,000	1,376,000	2,019,000	10,788,000
Tennessee.....	6,826,000	5,320,000	2,495,000	14,641,000	1,765,000	1,915,000	3,680,000	18,321,000
Texas.....	20,432,000	13,681,000	8,267,000	42,380,000	4,135,000	5,730,000	9,865,000	52,245,000
Utah.....	3,621,000	2,396,000	731,000	6,748,000	643,000	1,014,000	1,657,000	8,405,000
Vermont.....	1,543,000	1,029,000	260,000	2,841,000	643,000	429,000	1,072,000	3,913,000
Virginia.....	5,983,000	4,650,000	2,691,000	13,324,000	1,779,000	1,680,000	3,459,000	16,783,000
Washington.....	5,207,000	3,479,000	2,604,000	11,290,000	1,276,000	1,461,000	2,737,000	14,027,000
West Virginia.....	3,435,000	2,990,000	1,123,000	7,548,000	1,075,000	965,000	2,040,000	9,588,000
Wisconsin.....	7,441,000	5,192,000	3,379,000	16,012,000	1,842,000	2,088,000	3,930,000	19,942,000
Wyoming.....	3,928,000	2,662,000	188,000	6,778,000	643,000	1,099,000	1,742,000	8,520,000
Hawaii.....	1,543,000	1,029,000	580,000	3,152,000				3,152,000
District of Columbia.....	1,543,000	1,029,000	1,491,000	4,063,000	643,000	429,000	1,072,000	5,135,000
Puerto Rico.....	1,635,000	1,709,000	1,483,000	4,827,000				4,827,000

¹ Apportioned according to total population with minimum of $\frac{1}{4}$ of 1 percent.

² Apportioned according to sec. 21 of Federal Highway Act— $\frac{1}{3}$ area, $\frac{1}{3}$ total population, and $\frac{1}{3}$ post-road mileage, with minimum of $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 percent.

Mr. MARTIN. Other than changes in authorization amounts, there was one point in which the Senate fully receded from its position, and that was with respect to the authorization of \$10 million for defense access roads. The Senate conferees made every effort to hold this item in the bill, but were unable to convince the House conferees. It was pointed out that there is a backlog of approximately \$53 million of authorizations

which have not yet been appropriated for.

It was also the strong feeling of the House conferees that the authorization for roads, having as their principal purpose defense or military interest, should be included in military or defense legislation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. As the author of that particular amendment, I realize there is a carryover authorization of \$53 million; but I felt, and I still feel very deeply, that the provision should go into this bill and become a part of the law pertaining to highway system, because the time has come when the civilian defense and the military defense of America are so connected with the highway system that they are really one. There-

fore, I cannot agree that the provision belongs in a separate bill. However, I think it is better to have it in a separate bill than not to have it in any bill at all.

Mr. MARTIN. I might say to the distinguished Senator from Michigan that for some time I have been making speeches over the country favoring improvement of roads because of their importance in civilian defense and in military activities. In the conference the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], all urged most strongly the inclusion of this item in the bill, but the House conferees had seemingly discussed the subject previously, and they were in opposition to it.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. I note that the item for forest roads and trails, which had been included in the House bill at \$22,500,000, and was increased by the Senate to \$25 million, was held in conference at \$24 million; is that correct?

Mr. MARTIN. That is correct.

Mr. CORDON. I wish to extend my compliments to the Senate conferees for the work I know they had to do in that particular field. Coming from a State which has within its confines some 300 billion board-feet of standing merchantable timber, and more than 14 million acres of national forests which are covered with merchantable timber, I know the value of that particular appropriation, not only so far as the future is concerned, but the value of it as an investment, repayment for which will begin almost coincidentally with the spending of the first dollar.

These particular roads make the Federal Government's investment in standing timber a usable one. They make perpetual management of timber a fact, rather than a theory. Sustained yield becomes something that can be realized, as well as talked about. The old-growth timber, which now is being wasted because it is too old and because it is being attacked by disease and is being blown down, can be salvaged, as a result of these roads. So the money appropriated for this purpose will be reimbursed not only in principal amount, but also is vastly increased amounts.

I congratulate the conferees, but I regret that they were unable to obtain the full amount voted by the Senate.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, I may say that the Senate conferee who represents one of the easternmost States was one of the strongest advocates in conference for retention of the full amount voted by the Senate. I refer to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], who has great knowledge of values of that kind.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEALL in the chair). Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. MARTIN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. Inasmuch as the adoption of the conference report will conclude legislative action on this very important and very meritorious bill, I wish to take this opportunity to express the appreciation I sincerely feel for the fair, courteous, and thorough study the distinguished chairman of the committee has made, and for the fair, fine, and impartial way in which he has presided over the committee. I desire to express the same sentiments regarding the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Pennsylvania will yield further to me—

Mr. MARTIN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. I should like to call the attention of the Senate to page 6 of the conference report. I wish to point out that in section 17 (a) the committee has undertaken to assure that the maximum amount of highway work will be performed by means of competitive bidding; and that in section 17 (b) for the first time collusion and conspiracy to defraud, in connection with the obtaining or awarding of Federal-aid Highway contracts, is made a Federal criminal offense.

For the benefit of the Senate, I should like to read section 17 (b):

(b) In any case in which approval by the Secretary of Commerce of any contract for such highway construction work is required, the Secretary shall require as a condition precedent to such approval a sworn statement executed by, or on behalf of, the person, firm, association, or corporation to whom such contract is to be awarded, certifying that such person, firm, association, or corporation has not, either directly or indirectly, entered into any agreement, participated in any collusion, or otherwise taken any action in restraint of free competitive bidding in connection with such contract.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me, so that I may make a brief observation in connection with the point now under discussion?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I think the RECORD should show at this point that the section from which the Senator from Tennessee has just read is the result of his determined effort in the hearings and in the work of the committee to get this item included in the bill. I desire to express my congratulations to him upon his consistent and effective efforts in getting this very constructive section into the conference report. I think the Senator from Tennessee deserves special credit for that particular work.

I apologize for the interruption, but I thought the RECORD should show at this point the interest of the Senator from Tennessee in the matter.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I appreciate very much indeed the remarks of the able Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. President, I call attention to the provision which is now to become law, I hope, with the signature of the President. I desire to call this matter to the attention of the Senate, and also, to the attention of the country. I believe we should let the people know that the eye of the Federal Government will be upon

the execution and performance of Federal-aid road contracts. That arrangement will do a great deal to restrain what, according to rumor, amounts to a widespread practice of kickbacks of certain portions of the funds under highway contracts, collusion in restraint of free competitive bidding, and other malpractices.

This measure authorizes appropriations of nearly \$1 billion, to be matched by funds in approximately that amount by the States—an immense amount of money. Certainly the taxpayers are entitled to all the roads that can be purchased by that money, without any political shenanigans or corrupt practices.

This provision will require that before a road contract can be approved, an affidavit on behalf of the successful bidder, the contractor to whom the award has been made, must be submitted. Under those circumstances, if fraud has been committed, the contractor will then become particeps criminis to the perpetration of it, and therefore will become subject to the criminal code which provides a penalty of 5 years imprisonment or a fine of \$10,000, or both. I hope it will be a constructive provision of law.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the conferees on the part of the House also refused to agree to the provision voted by the Senate to permit the President to advance the effective date of the authorization, under certain conditions. The conferees on the part of the House felt that Congress could take up this matter separately, if it should be necessary to do so.

Mr. President, I believe the report, as agreed to by the conferees, is an excellent one, and marks a new milestone in the progress of highway improvement.

I now move that the conference report be agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. In approving the conference report on this bill, I think it should be pointed out, at the time of final action on this measure, that it represents 3 new matters of policy. First, this measure carries the largest authorization ever made in a highway bill, so I understand. It represents recognition of the growing demand—it is more than a need; it is a demand—in connection with the highway systems of the United States, and especially the national highway system, which is not an incidental part of our economy, but is a part of the very lifeblood of our economy.

Furthermore, this measure represents new policy, to the extent that this is the first time we have voted such a large authorization of appropriations for the interstate highway system, a system receiving unanimous support, inasmuch as the need for the system is widely recognized.

Mr. President, I did not favor the full amount of the authorization voted for the interstate highway system, but I recognize that it must be provided for, and I want the Congress to provide for it, to the extent of the need, without doing violence to the other features of the highway system.

The conference report also represents new policy because of the provision for

matching on a 60-40 basis, with 60 percent of the funds to be provided by the Federal Government and 40 percent of the funds to be provided by the States.

The conference report further represents new policy, in that it establishes a new formula for division among the States of the funds for the interstate system.

I agreed to the \$175 million authorization provided in the bill for the interstate system. I thought perhaps we were going too fast in such a short time, in that connection; but I recognized the need.

I wish to point out that at the present time, 34 percent of the funds for the primary system can be spent on the interstate system, and 46 percent of the funds for urban roads can be spent on the interstate system; and when those funds are added to the \$175 million, they make a total of approximately \$300 million which can be used for the interstate system, under the new formula. I point that out to indicate that this expressly establishes a State system, on trial. It is expressly put on trial by the new program, and by this congressional act. We shall all watch it with interest and, I may say, with some scrutiny, for the next 2 years.

I believe we have gone as far as we should go in liberalizing the formula for the distribution of the money. That will be determined by the facts as they may develop over the next 2 years. I think it is fair to say that we wanted this system to be developed and favored to the extent of meeting a need without, at the same time, doing violence to the other aspect of our highway system, which is just as necessary, within its sphere, and just as much needed by the people it serves, within their sphere of activities, as are interstate highways by the people whom they are primarily designed to serve.

With those considerations, I am very glad to support wholeheartedly the conference report.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think the bill has been, in general, well discussed. I congratulate the able chairman of the full committee, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the able chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. CASE], and all who have had an active part in bringing about this excellent result.

I wish to invite attention to 2 or 3 features of the bill which I think are outstanding. The distinguished Senator from Mississippi has already mentioned one of them, namely, the great enlargement of the authorization for the interstate system, which will find itself with an authorization of \$175 million Federal-aid for each of the 2 fiscal years 1956 and 1957, covered by this particular bill.

I thoroughly agree with the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] that members of the committee will be watching with a great deal of interest to see what happens on construction of the interstate system because of this large authorization, which represents a very material change in policy, but one which I think is decidedly

in the interest of the Nation, both from the standpoint of better preparation for defense and more adequate handling of the ordinary transportation and travel needs of the Nation. There is no doubt that the areas of great congestion of population in the United States, because of the great costs involved, are those in which trunk highways have not been constructed, and in which there would be the greatest difficulty in time of war. There is already very great difficulty in those bottlenecks in time of peace.

The other two matters which I shall mention briefly are quite different. One is found in section 6 of the bill. It appeared in the Senate bill, but not in the House bill. However, the House agreed with the Senate that the construction of forest highways, forest development roads and trails, park roads and trails in national parks, and Indian roads was so far behind that the authorizations which have been made from time to time have been allowed to pile up, and in many instances to lapse. The Senate felt that contractual authorizations should be given so that in the case of those very grave needs, construction could move ahead speedily with appropriations to come later.

However, a compromise was made between the Senate bill and the House bill. Under the Senate bill all the accumulated authorizations in these fields would have been available for immediate contract, whereas under the terms of the conference report only the authorizations for the next fiscal year, 1955, and for the 2 fiscal years covered by this particular bill, 1956 and 1957, will be authorizations for which contractual authority is given.

It is the very great hope of the conferees and, in fact, of all members of the Public Works Committees of both Houses, that this provision will mean that the road needs which I have mentioned in connection with the forests, the parks, and Indian lands, will be met much more effectively than has been the case at any time heretofore.

The other matter which I shall mention was one with respect to which the House receded and permitted the Senate provision to take effect. That was with reference to now providing the authorization to see through and to complete construction of the remaining links of the inter-American highway. The Senate in its bill had provided an authorization of \$40 million over the next 5 fiscal years, or \$8 million a year. The House agreed to accept that amendment. Therefore the passage of this bill will mark the authorization of the completion of that important inter-American project. I call attention specifically to this matter at this time both because it has been a matter of some confusion, and sometimes of considerable argument between ourselves and some of our good neighbors south of us, and because it seems to me that this action shows clearly that our country recognizes its obligation to carry through its part of this project promptly, and it indicates that we propose, in the effort to help ourselves and our near neighbors, from the Mexican border down to the Panama

Canal, to make this immediate effort to complete the communication by land between ourselves and them. I think it is something that has needed to be done for a long time. We have been going along from year to year without making too much progress. This authorization will see the important project to completion.

There are other matters in the bill which are of importance, but I wished to mention those three as being of particular interest to the Senate. I am glad that there are so many Senators present to receive the report of the conference committee with reference to this important bill, which I regard as a good bill for our whole Nation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as a member of the Public Works Committee I wish to compliment the Senate conferees for what I think is a very fine job which they did in conference in ironing out the differences between the House and Senate with respect to the public roads bill.

Although, as my colleagues know, I fought in the committee for a much larger amount, believing that the total figure provided by the bill as reported to the Senate was not adequate in view of the testimony in our committee that approximately \$35 billion was needed to put the highways of America in condition to meet the transportation needs of the country, nevertheless, as the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] have pointed out, the committee did bring before the Senate a larger road bill, so far as the proposed authorization is concerned, than has come to the floor of the Senate in many years.

I wish particularly to thank my colleagues in the committee, and especially the Senate conferees, for the final figures in connection with forest access roads, for roads and trails, park roads and trails, parkways, Indian roads, and public lands roads.

For forest roads and trails we find in the conference report an authorization of \$24 million, compared with the Senate figure of \$25 million and the House figure of \$22,500,000. We find the Senate figure of \$12,500,000 for park roads and trails. We also find a reasonable compromise, I think, in respect to parkways. We find that there has been an acceptance of the House figure with respect to Indian roads. The figure for so-called public lands roads is \$1 million. Such roads are very important to the Western States, where there are large areas of public lands through which more highways need to be built in order to provide the connections necessary for an efficient road system.

Particularly in connection with the forest highways and access roads, what the conferees did was to provide a figure which, in my judgment, in the long run, will mean great savings to the taxpayers of the United States, because, through these expenditures of funds, it will be possible to get out of the Federal forests timber which otherwise would be completely wasted. I am sure that the timber will bring to the United States Treas-

ury, as a result of its harvesting, many times the cost of these roads.

I believe that frequently the Senate is not fully appreciative, or does not manifest its appreciation, of the good work done by its conferees. In my opinion, the conferees have done a remarkably fine job of public service, and I am pleased to say a word of commendation in behalf of their work.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation once more to my colleagues on the committee and to the Senate for including in the bill the so-called Connecticut amendment. I do that not only on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], but also on behalf of all the people of my State.

The RECORD should show my appreciation also to the Members of the House who served as conferees, for making it possible for us to incorporate the amendment in the bill.

It is a very important matter, because it makes available to our State a tremendous sum of money with which to do some very important and necessary work in connection with the \$400 million expressway. I feel that all of the people of Connecticut, the Governor, the highway commissioner, and the taxpayers, are very grateful to Congress for helping them by incorporating the amendment in the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield at that point?

Mr. BUSH. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I believe the Nation as a whole owes a debt to the Senator from Connecticut for the way he has worked, so patiently and so long, on this problem, which is peculiar to Connecticut. I believe the Nation is indebted to the great State of Connecticut for inaugurating a \$400 million highway program, which I understand is to begin within a few days.

Mr. BUSH. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. I am sure it will serve as a tremendous boost to that very great area of the country. Perhaps it will serve as a pattern for the solution of similar problems in other areas of the United States. While it is true that this is the largest highway bill ever to be considered by the Senate, amounting to \$900 million, the great State of Connecticut, small in area though it be, is planning to inaugurate a \$400 million highway program. I congratulate the Senator and his State.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator from Mississippi for his very generous comments. I must confess it is quite true that it is a big project for our State. That is why I am so grateful to my colleagues for cooperating with us and giving us this last go-ahead in the bill.

As a member of the committee, my whole experience with the bill has been a revelation to me in connection with how the members of the committee have worked together in trying to prepare a fine bill.

I believe every member of the committee has made an important contribution in connection with the bill. I

am sure the chairman of the committee appreciates that fact.

Once more I express my appreciation to the chairman of the committee, who has expedited the consideration of the bill. I do not believe we could have disposed of it any quicker than we have.

THE MUTUAL SPECIAL WEAPONS PROGRAM

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I shall claim the attention of the Senate for only 2 or 3 minutes, to speak on a subject which is unrelated to the pending conference report.

At an evening session of the Senate on July 29 last, I raised a question on the necessity and advisability of an appropriation of \$50 million in a new category in the mutual security appropriation bill. I offered an amendment that evening to strike out the item, and made the argument that it had not been justified, and that no definite proposal had been submitted. Furthermore, I argued that whatever action might be contemplated by such a new venture could be accomplished by the regular appropriation categories.

I shall not review the debate of that evening. However, for the benefit of Senators who voted for my amendment, I should like to invite attention to the fact that I hold in my hand a letter from Mr. John H. Ohly, Deputy Director for Program and Planning, Foreign Operations Administration, dated March 30, 1954, which, in my opinion, justifies the position we asserted on that occasion.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I shall read one sentence from the letter:

Assuming that adequate funds had been made available in the mutual security appropriation, it is possible that these projects could have been carried out under the terms and provisions of sections 401 and 411 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, and section 101 (a) (1) of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended.

Mr. President, that is what I said last July was possible to be done. I said then that the new category under the title of the mutual special-weapons program had as its real purpose the securing of larger appropriations from Congress. That is now revealed to have been the fact, despite the aura of secrecy thrown around this matter last year.

Mr. President, I invite attention to this fact at this time to alert the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the members of the Committee on Appropriations.

I also invite attention to the ye-and-nay vote on the amendment. The Members of the Senate who voted for my amendment were ANDERSON, DANIEL, DOUGLAS, FREAR, GOLDWATER, GORE, HUMPHREY, HUNT, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, KENNEDY, LONG, MANSFIELD, McCLELLAN, MONRONEY, MURRAY, NEELY,

PASTORE, RUSSELL, SMATHERS, SPARKMAN, SYMINGTON, and WILLIAMS.

EXHIBIT 1

FOREIGN OPERATIONS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 30, 1954.

HON. ALBERT GORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GORE: This is in reply to your letter of March 16, 1954, in which you ask whether the projects approved under the mutual special-weapons program could have been carried out had not a special appropriation been made.

Assuming that adequate funds had been made available in the mutual-security appropriation, it is possible that these projects could have been carried out under the terms and provisions of sections 401 and 411 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, and section 101 (a) (1) of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended. However, at the time of the fiscal year 1954 congressional presentation it was believed that the purposes of a special-weapons program represented a departure from normal MDAP procedures, and in order to resolve all doubts as to congressional approval of such a program, and the Administration's ability to administer such a program without specific authority to do so, it was decided to include this additional section in the act, although perhaps not strictly necessary. Moreover, in addition to the advantages of developing legislative history on the funding of this program, rather than simply relying upon an interpretation of the general provisions of the act, there was believed to be a significant psychological impact on our allies in having the Congress of the United States make specific provision for a program to develop in Europe and the United States special weapons for the defense of free Europe.

We believe the reasons which warranted inclusion of a special section in the fiscal year 1954 act are still valid and that the fiscal year 1955 act should contain a similar provision.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. OHLY,
Deputy Director for Program and Planning.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1954—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8127) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

CONSTRUCTION OF HIGHWAYS—CORRECTION IN ENROLLMENT OF H. R. 8127

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate, House Concurrent Resolution 225, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 8127) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize ap-

appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, the Clerk of the House is authorized and directed to make the following correction: In section 13 of the bill strike out "The Commissioner of Public Roads" and insert in lieu thereof "The Secretary of Commerce."

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 225) was considered, and agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, at this time I wish publicly to express my great appreciation to the members of the Committee on Public Works for the time and work they devoted to perfecting the road bill, so that it could be brought before the Senate and promptly passed.

It contains the largest authorization for roads in the history of the United States. Some people have thought it peculiar that I should favor a large appropriation of this kind, because I have always advocated economy in Government and balanced budgets. The people of the United States, however, have been spending almost \$3½ billion a year for roads, and the Federal Government has not been contributing even the amount it has been collecting from gasoline taxes or from taxes on the sale of automobiles and from similar sources.

I again wish to express my appreciation to the members of the committee. They attended the sessions without any hesitancy at all, and sat for many long hours. I believe we have brought forth a bill which should be of great benefit to the people of the United States.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 146) to authorize the designation of October 16, 1954, as National Olympic Day, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC BUILDINGS BY PURCHASE CONTRACTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6342) to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1949 to authorize the Administrator of General Services to acquire title to real property and to provide for the construction of certain public buildings thereon by executing purchase contracts; to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to lease quarters for post-office purposes; and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What is the pending business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment to H. R. 6342.

Mr. WILLIAMS obtained the floor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. About how long does the Senator expect to speak?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think my statement will not take more than 10 or 15 minutes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am trying to determine a little matter of time, if the Senator will yield, because I should like to announce that when we get back to the subject of the pending bill I have an amendment at the desk which I wish to call up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Arkansas that the bill is now under consideration.

OPERATIONS OF THE HOUSING ACTIVITIES OF THE FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION AND THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] discussed certain phases of the operations of the Federal Housing Authority. I wish to make a brief comment only as to that section of the bill relating to loans which are made, being section 608.

There are indictments pending on the case to which I refer and, therefore, it would not be advisable to name the case. I do wish to point out certain factors which I think should be rather enlightening, because the particular individual involved obtained approximately \$7 million under title 608 of the Housing Act. I wish to outline certain correspondence which passed at that time.

A Member of the Senate invited the attention of the Housing Authority in 1950 to the fact that perhaps there had been excessive profits made. This letter was not addressed to me. I shall read one paragraph from it in acknowledgement of the report that these excessive profits were called to the attention of the then Housing Administrator but which paragraph indicates a complete lack of interest on the part of the Administration.

The letter is dated August 10, 1950, and I read this paragraph from it:

Please be advised that it is not the customary practice of this administration to search the court records to determine the original cost of lots purchased, as our commitments for insurance were based on the value arrived at by an appraiser on the staff of the insuring office.

That letter was signed by the Commissioner Franklin D. Richards and it clearly indicated that the Department was not interested at that time in examining any of the so-called excessive profits. This letter was in answer to the allegation that the particular contractor had bought two lots for \$15,000. Three or 4 days later he deeded those two lots to two different corporations which were

obtaining an FHA guaranteed loan. They were appraised at \$50,000 each yet Mr. Richards was not interested.

Mr. President, I wish also to invite attention which shows conspiracy behind it and how this same group were going to cash in on these irregular if not illegal earnings, by reporting them for income-tax purposes as capital gains.

I quote from a letter signed by the Collector of Internal Revenue in the area involved in which he ruled upon this case:

This will acknowledge receipt of your request of October 12 to be advised with respect to your proposed purchase of a vacant lot and several days later creating a corporation and deeding the lot to the corporation at a stated value of \$50,000. You request to be advised if you will be taxable on the apparent short-term gain of \$40,000. You are advised that this transaction will not be subject to the tax, provided you are the sole or principal stockholder of the corporation, namely, that you own as much as 80 percent of its value.

However, for future gain or loss on the sale of this stock your basis will be \$10,000 of the original cost.

Clearly, Mr. President, this was an advance ruling on a hypothetical case, extending to the individual involved the right to charge off as capital gains these highly irregular profits. Names are omitted because this case is now in court.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator be good enough to tell us who made that ruling?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should not like to do that. I will say to the Senator—

Mr. MAYBANK. I wanted the information for the RECORD. A person who would attempt to charge off as capital gains millions and millions of dollars of profit would be as guilty as anyone could be. The Senator from Delaware knows that was not the intention of the law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree with the Senator. This letter has been referred to the Department of Justice. It is also being referred to both the Byrd committee and the Banking and Currency Committee.

My reason for not identifying the person who signed the letter is that it would identify the area and, perhaps, the case. As I previously stated, there are indictments pending in the courts in this case, and I do not want to jeopardize any action by the courts. The Senator from South Carolina is welcome to read the letter.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As I understand, the Senator from Delaware is speaking with reference to abuses under section 608 of the act?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator will remember that I spoke on that subject and was successful in getting amendments agreed to in 1951 which checked some of the abuses.

I should like to ask the Senator this question: Was Commissioner Hollyday dismissed because of abuses which occurred under section 608, or was he dismissed in connection with abuses occurring under title I?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I suggest that the Senator address that question to the President of the United States. Personally I think the President should be commended for his prompt action. I am discussing the situation as it relates to what I consider to be highly irregular transactions in the FHA. They have been referred not only to the executive branch but to the appropriate committees of Congress, and I do not want to get involved with the question of which administration is responsible. I think what we should do is to let the record speak for itself.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware further yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that there have been many recent cases of abuses in connection with FHA loans? In February I invited the attention of Mr. Hollyday to 90 cases of abuses in Illinois. We do not want to cover up—and I am sure the Senator from Delaware is not doing that—the current abuses by going back to section 608.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not believe the Senator means to prejudge my statement, but if he will allow me to finish it, the next question which I shall take up is one which is current. I do not think we want to exclude any of the information. I am making a report which had been prepared for delivery before the recent announcement this week. I think when this case has been explored thoroughly, the American people will be able to judge who is responsible, regardless of where the chips may fall.

I am not pointing out this case merely on the basis that it happened prior to this administration. The next one I shall take up is one having reference to correspondence in 1953; and I think I have some in 1954.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is important that we take these matters up as we go along. The Senator will remember that I fought as strenuously as did anyone on the floor to remove abuses under section 608, but I do not want to have the impression go out that section 608 abuses are the only ones under FHA, and I do not want the impression to go out that there have not been abuses under title I.

Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I may say to the Senator from Illinois that if he will stay and listen, I shall talk about abuses under other sections of the law, but I cannot do it by yielding.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield for a brief statement?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wish to say that I attended a meeting of the Committee on Banking and Currency this morning. The Senator from Delaware is familiar with the fact that I know something of what has happened. I wish to speak in justice to the chairman of the

committee, the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], who is not now present. We all know of what he, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] have done. We know of their cooperation.

I am hopeful, as the Senator from Delaware has indicated he is, that appropriate action will be taken, let the chips fall where they may. I am certain that that is what the Senator from Delaware, the Senator from Virginia, the Senator from Indiana, and all of the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency wish to do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. All of these particulars, in their completeness, will be referred to the committee of which the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Illinois are members. I am certain the matters will be fully explored, without any regard as to when they might have happened, and that, in the end result, we shall be able to determine who is responsible.

To return briefly to the outline of this particular case, as I said before it involved 7 different loans by 1 contractor, aggregating approximately \$7 million. As of today, 4 of the loans are under foreclosure; 3 of them are current in their payments.

It is interesting to note that one of them was foreclosed on the date when the contractor received his seventh loan. I suppose he was handed the notice at the same time.

As I have said earlier, there is no indication anywhere, that the department was in the least bit interested when the situation was called to their attention on repeated occasions during the last 3 years.

I might say that I have correspondence calling this particular case to the attention of the previous administration, as well as to the present administration; however, under the present administration there are indictments.

I think it might be well to point out that the recipient of these seven loans boasted of the fact that he contributed, only a few weeks prior to the first loan, \$25,000 to the Democratic campaign in 1948. I think that fact should be made a matter of record, because the fellow was so proud of it and boasted about it throughout the campaign.

I now wish to speak briefly about another phase of the situation, namely, the loans made to the individual homeowners.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Delaware know whether or not the same individual also contributed to the Republican campaign fund, since that is usually what persons of that type do?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am speaking only from the record. If anyone has additional information I will be glad to have it included. He referred only to the one contribution to the Truman campaign of 1948.

I now wish to refer to loans made to individual owners under the FHA and the Veterans' Administration, as well, be-

cause it is hard to separate the loans simply by speaking of one kind or the other. In many instances the same home buyer obtained a VA loan and an FHA loan jointly. I ran into that situation so many times that in speaking of it I shall speak about both.

I shall first direct my remarks to the situation in connection with the Veterans' Administration, because it seems that so many of the complaints go back to the high appraisals which are given to the homes after they are constructed. I was advised under date of December 11, 1953, that the policy of the Veterans' Administration was as follows:

I am pleased to enclose a copy of the Veterans' Administration Technical Bulletin 4A-111, entitled "Control of Fees and Assignments to Designated Appraisers and Compliance Inspectors." This will supply you with much of the information sought in your letter of December 2, 1953.

You will note from this enclosure that there are restrictions as to the amount fee appraisers and inspectors can receive from the Veterans' Administration assignments. The ceiling on the aggregate fees permitted is \$1,000 per month and is applicable to all offices of the Veterans' Administration.

Continuing, they said:

Nothing prohibits a qualified individual from serving as both appraiser and inspector. His combined fees would apply toward the maximum established ceiling. Combined fees for both activities may not exceed \$1,000 per month.

I might say, in explanation, that the fees are based upon \$5 per inspection. As the inspectors go around and inspect various homes, they charge \$5 for each inspection, which is passed on to and is paid by the home buyer. So in each instance, the fee is paid by the veteran himself.

After receiving that letter, I called to the attention of the Veterans' Administration the fact that there were persons serving in inspection and appraisal capacities who were at that time making as much as \$2,500 a month under the ruling.

I shall outline one case. It is the most glaring case, but it is not the only case I could cite, in which an inspector's earnings exceeded \$1,000 a month. Lest an attempt be made to explain it by saying that the persons were working on an average basis, that in some months the payments were high, and that in the next month they were below, I wish to point out that I have figures covering the earnings of one individual, which show the following:

During a 2-year period, this individual exceeded his monthly limitation 13 times, the range of his earnings being as follows:

December 1951, \$2,491.60; June 1952, \$1,472; July 1952, \$1,192; August 1952, \$1,777.30; September 1952, \$1,290.15; October 1952, \$1,279.65; November 1952, \$1,130; February 1953, \$1,119.20; November 1953, \$1,234.50; May 1953, \$1,133.85; August 1953, \$1,187.50; September 1953, \$1,214.60; October 1953, \$1,540.

That particular individual is working at the Veterans' Administration in Wilmington, Del. I thought I might as well cite an instance in my home State. But

H. CON. RES. 225

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 14, 1954

Mr. DONDERO submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

1 *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate*
2 *concurring)*, That in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 8127)
3 to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act ap-
4 proved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and
5 supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the
6 construction of highways, and for other purposes, the Clerk
7 of the House is authorized and directed to make the following
8 correction:

9 In section 13 of the bill strike out "The Commissioner of
10 Public Roads" and insert in lieu thereof "The Secretary of
11 Commerce".

H. CON. RES. 225

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Amending H. R. 8127, an Act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916.

By Mr. DONDERO

APRIL 14, 1954

Considered and agreed to

Public Law 350 - 83d Congress
Chapter 181 - 2d Session
H. R. 8127

AN ACT

To amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), and all Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$700,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954.
23 USC 9a note.
Appropriation.

The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be available for expenditure as follows:

68 Stat. 70.
68 Stat. 71.

(a) \$315,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system.

(b) \$210,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid secondary system.

(c) \$175,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system in urban areas, and for projects on approved extensions of the Federal-aid secondary system within urban areas.

The sums authorized by this section for each fiscal year, respectively, shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with the formulas set forth in section 4 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838).

Apportionment.

Any sums apportioned to any State under the provision of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for two years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized, and any amounts so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse: *Provided*, That such funds for any fiscal year shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums apportioned to the State for such fiscal year is covered by formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the improvement of specific projects as provided by this Act: *Provided further*, That in the case of those sums heretofore, herein, or hereafter apportioned to any State for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system, the Secretary of Commerce may, upon the request of any State, discharge his responsibility relative to the plans, specifications, estimates, surveys, contract awards, design, inspection, and construction of such secondary road projects by his receiving and approving a certified statement by the State highway department setting forth that the plans, design, and construction for such projects are in accord with the standards and procedures of such State applicable to projects in this category approved by him: *Provided further*, That such approval shall not be given unless such standards and procedures are in accordance with the objectives set forth in section 1 (b) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950: *Provided further*, That nothing contained in the foregoing provisos shall be construed to relieve any State of its obligation now provided by law relative to maintenance, nor to relieve the Secretary of Commerce of his obligation with respect to the selection of the secondary system or the location of projects thereon, to make a final inspection after construction of each project, and to require an adequate showing of the estimated and actual cost of construction of each project: *Provided further*, That not more than 10 per centum of the amount apportioned to each State under subparagraphs (a), (b), or (c) of this section may be transferred from the apportionment under one subparagraph to the apportionment under either of the other subparagraphs: *Provided further*,

64 Stat. 786.

That such transfer is requested by the State highway department and is approved by the Governor of said State and the Secretary of Commerce as being in the public interest: *Provided further*, That the total of such transfers shall not increase the original apportionment under any subparagraph by more than 10 per centum: *Provided further*, That the transfers hereinabove permitted for funds authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1956, and June 30, 1957, shall likewise be permitted on the same basis for funds heretofore or hereafter authorized to be appropriated for any prior or subsequent fiscal year: *And provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be deemed to alter or impair the authority contained in the last proviso to subparagraph (b) of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944.

68 Stat. 71.

69 Stat. 72.

58 Stat. 839.

Interstate
highways.

58 Stat. 842.

23 USC 60.

Apportionment.

Federal share.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, and improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the national system of interstate highways, including extensions thereof through urban areas, designated in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of \$175,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like additional sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957. The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be apportioned among the several States in the following manner: one-half in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, as shown by the latest available Federal census: *Provided*, That no State shall receive less than three-fourths of 1 per centum of the money so apportioned; and one-half in the manner now provided by law for apportionment of funds for the Federal-aid primary system: *Provided further*, That the Federal share payable on account of any project on the national system of interstate highways provided for by funds made available under the provisions of this section shall be increased to 60 per centum of the total cost thereof, plus a percentage of the remaining 40 per centum of such cost in any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 per centum of the total area of all lands therein, equal to the percentage that the area of such lands in such State is of its total area.

(b) Any sums apportioned to any State under the provisions of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for two years after the close of fiscal year for which such sums are authorized: *Provided*, That such funds shall be deemed to be expended upon execution of formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the improvement of specific projects under this section.

(c) Any amount apportioned to the States under the provisions of this section unexpended at the end of the period during which it is available for expenditure under the terms of subsection (b) of this section shall lapse.

Forest roads.
23 USC 23.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218), as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of \$22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957; and (2) for forest development roads and trails the sum of \$24,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957: *Provided*, That with respect to any proposed construction or reconstruction of a timber access road, advisory public hearings shall be held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area of construction or reconstruction with notice and reasonable opportunity for interested persons to present their views as to the practicability

and feasibility of such construction or reconstruction: *Provided further*, That hereafter funds available for forest development roads and trails shall also be available for vehicular parking areas: *Provided further*, That the appropriation herein authorized for forest highways shall be apportioned by the Secretary of Commerce for expenditure in the several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico in accordance with the provision of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950.

SEC. 4. (a) For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas administered by the National Park Service, including areas authorized to be established as national parks and monuments, and national park and monument approach roads authorized by the Act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat. 1053), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$12,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

(b) For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of parkways, authorized by Acts of Congress, on lands to which title is vested in the United States, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$11,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

(c) For the construction, improvement, and maintenance of Indian reservation roads and bridges and roads and bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian lands under the provisions of the Act approved May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957: *Provided*, That the location, type, and design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be approved by the Secretary of Commerce before any expenditures are made thereon, and all such construction shall be under the general supervision of the Secretary of Commerce.

SEC. 5. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 10 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the survey, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of main roads through unappropriated or unreserved public lands, nontaxable Indian lands, or other Federal reservations the sum of \$1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, to remain available until expended.

SEC. 6. Any funds authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, or herein authorized for forest highways, forest development roads and trails, park roads and trails, parkways, Indian roads, and public lands highways shall be immediately available for contract: *Provided*, That any amount remaining unexpended two years after the close of the fiscal year for which authorized shall lapse. The Secretary of the Department charged with the administration of such funds is hereby granted authority to incur obligations, approve projects, and enter into contracts under such authorizations and his action in doing so shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof and such funds shall be deemed to have been expended when so obligated.

SEC. 7. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 1 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for cooperation with Central American Republics in the construction of the Inter-American Highway", approved December 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 860), as amended by section 11 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to the sums heretofore authorized, the sum of \$8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and a like sum

64 Stat. 786.
23 USC 23 note.
National-park
roads.
68 Stat. 72.
68 Stat. 73.
16 USC 8a-8c.

Parkways.

Indian roads.

25 USC 318a.

Federal
reservations.
64 Stat. 789.

Administration
of funds.

Inter-American
Highway.

64 Stat. 789.

for each fiscal year thereafter up to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, to be available until expended, to enable the United States to cooperate with the Governments of the American Republics situated in Central America—that is, with the Governments of the Republics of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama—in the survey and completion of construction of the Inter-American Highway within the borders of the aforesaid Republics, respectively. Not to exceed one-third of the appropriation authorized for each fiscal year may be expended without requiring the country or countries in which such sums may be expended to match any part thereof, if the Secretary of State shall find that the cost of constructing said highway in such country or countries will be beyond their reasonable capacity to bear.

68 Stat. 73.
68 Stat. 74.

Nicaragua.
66 Stat. 160.

SEC. 8. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 5 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 158), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State, in addition to the sums heretofore authorized, the sum of \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, to be available until expended, for completing the United States obligation under the applicable agreement with the Republic of Nicaragua: *Provided*, That the survey and construction work authorized by the said section 5 shall be under the general supervision of the Secretary of Commerce.

Civil defense.

SEC. 9. In order to assure that adequate consideration is given to civil defense aspects in the planning and construction of highways constructed or reconstructed with the aid of Federal funds, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to consult, from time to time, with the Federal Civil Defense Administrator relative to the civil defense aspects of highways so constructed or reconstructed.

Research
program.

SEC. 10. (a) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized in his discretion to engage in research on all phases of highway construction, reconstruction, modernization, development, design, maintenance, safety, financing, and traffic conditions, including the effect thereon of State laws, and is authorized to test, develop, or assist in the testing and developing of any material, invention, patented article, or process. The Secretary may carry out the authority granted hereby, either independently, or in cooperation with any other branch of the Government, State agency, authority, association, institution, corporation (profit or nonprofit), or any other organization, or person. The funds required to carry out the provisions of this subsection shall be taken out of the administrative and research funds authorized by section 21 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 212), as amended. The provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C., sec. 5) shall not be applicable to contracts or agreements made under the authority of this subsection.

42 Stat. 217.
23 USC 21.

(b) The Secretary shall include in the highway research program herein authorized studies of economic highway geometrics, structures, and desirable weight and size standards for vehicles using the public highways and of the feasibility of uniformity in State regulations with respect to such standards, and he shall report from time to time to the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and of the House of Representatives on the progress and findings with respect to such studies.

Report.

Study of utility
relocation.

SEC. 11. The Secretary of Commerce is hereby directed to make a study in cooperation with the State highway departments and other parties in interest relative to the problems posed by necessary relocation and reconstruction of public utilities services resulting from highway improvements authorized under this Act. Among other things, such a study shall include a review and financial analysis of existing

relationships between the State highway departments and affected utilities of all types, and a review of the various State statutes regulating existing relationships, to the end that a full and informative report may be made to the President for transmittal to the Congress of the United States not later than February 1, 1955. Report.

SEC. 12. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to transmit to the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and of the House of Representatives not later than December 31, 1954, a suggested draft of a bill or bills for a Federal Highway Act, which will include such provisions of existing law, and such changed or new provisions as the Secretary deems advisable. The Secretary shall also submit a report commenting on the draft of bill or bills, which shall include specific reference to each change in, or omission of, any provision of existing law. Federal Highway Act, draft of bill. Report.

SEC. 13. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to make a comprehensive study of all phases of highway financing, including a study of the costs of completing the several systems of highways in the several States and of the progress and feasibility of toll roads with particular attention to the possible effects of such toll roads upon the Federal-aid highway programs, and coordination thereof, and to make a report of his findings including recommendations with respect to Federal participation in toll roads, to be submitted to the Congress not later than February 1, 1955: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$100,000 from funds available for administrative expenses shall be expended for the purposes of this section. Highway financing, study. Report.

SEC. 14. For the purpose of expediting the interstate planning and coordination of a continuous Great River Road and appurtenances thereto traversing the Mississippi Valley from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico in general conformity with the provisions of the Federal Aid Road Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and with the recommended plan set forth in the joint report submitted to the Congress November 28, 1951, by the Secretaries of Commerce and Interior pursuant to the Act of August 24, 1949 (Public Law 262, Eighty-first Congress), there is hereby authorized to be expended by the Secretary of Commerce from general administrative funds not to exceed \$250,000; the amount expended under this section shall be apportioned among the ten States bordering the Mississippi River in proportion to the amount allocated by these respective States for the improvement and extension of existing sections of this highway project as approved by the Secretary of Commerce in cooperation with other public agencies concerned therewith. Great River Road. 39 Stat. 355. 23 USC 9a note. 63 Stat. 626.

SEC. 15. The term "highway", as defined in section 2 of the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921 (42 Stat. 212), as amended and supplemented, shall be deemed to include "tunnels". "Highway." 23 USC 2.

SEC. 16. The Secretary of Commerce may approve as a part of the Federal-aid secondary system, extensions through urban areas, connecting points on that system, provided that Federal participation in projects on such extensions shall be limited to urban funds. Urban area extensions.

SEC. 17. (a) Highway construction work performed in pursuance of agreements between the Secretary of Commerce and any State highway department which requires approval by the Secretary of Commerce and which is financed in whole or in part by funds authorized under this or succeeding Acts, shall be performed by contract awarded by competitive bidding under such procedures as may by regulations be prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce, unless the Secretary of Commerce shall affirmatively find that, under the circumstances relating to a given project, some other method is in the public interest. All such findings shall be reported promptly in writing to the Report. Contracts, etc.

Committees on Public Works of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

(b) In any case in which approval by the Secretary of Commerce of any contract for such highway construction work is required, the Secretary shall require as a condition precedent to such approval a sworn statement executed by, or on behalf of, the person, firm, association, or corporation to whom such contract is to be awarded, certifying that such person, firm, association, or corporation has not, either directly or indirectly, entered into any agreement, participated in any collusion, or otherwise taken any action in restraint of free competitive bidding in connection with such contract.

68 Stat. 75.

68 Stat. 76.

62 Stat. 753.

SEC. 18. Section 1020 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

“§ 1020. Highway projects

“Whoever, being an officer, agent, or employee of the United States, or of any State or Territory, or whoever, whether a person, association, firm, or corporation, knowingly makes any false statement, false representation, or false report as to the character, quality, quantity, or cost of the material used or to be used, or the quantity or quality of the work performed or to be performed, or the costs thereof in connection with the submission of plans, maps, specifications, contracts, or costs of construction of any highway or related project submitted for approval to the Secretary of Commerce; or

“Whoever knowingly makes any false statement, false representation, false report, or false claim with respect to the character, quality, quantity, or cost of any work performed or to be performed, or materials furnished or to be furnished, in connection with the construction of any highway or related project approved by the Secretary of Commerce; or

“Whoever knowingly makes any false statement or false representation as to a material fact in any statement, certificate, or report submitted pursuant to the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, “Shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.”

23 USC 9a note.

23 USC 60-63,

21, 23c, 3a

note.

16 USC 8b.

SEC. 19. All provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838); the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, approved June 29, 1948 (62 Stat. 1105); and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785); and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952, approved June 25, 1952 (66 Stat. 158), not inconsistent with this Act, shall remain in full force and effect.

Separability.

SEC. 20. If any section, subsection, or other provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act and the application of such section, subsection, or other provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Effective date.

SEC. 21. All Acts or parts of Acts in any way inconsistent with the provisions of this Act are hereby repealed, and this Act shall take effect on its passage.

Connecticut.

SEC. 22. (a) That all Federal-aid road funds heretofore paid on the section of Federal-Aid Primary Route Numbered 39 included in Federal-aid project UI-147 in the State of Connecticut, which section is to be made a part of a highway from the New York State line at Greenwich to the Rhode Island State line at Killingly, planned as an expressway authorized by chapter 107, part IV, General Statutes of Connecticut, 1953 Supplement, shall, prior to the collection of any tolls on said section, be repaid to the Treasurer of the United States, and the amount so repaid shall be deposited to the credit of the appropriation

for Federal-aid highways. At the time of such repayment, the project agreement with respect to said Federal-aid project UI-147 shall be cancelled. Any amount so repaid, together with the unpaid balance of any amount programed for expenditure on said project, shall be credited to the unprogramed balance of Federal-aid road funds of the same class last apportioned to the State of Connecticut. The amount so credited shall be in addition to all other funds then apportioned to said State and shall be available for expenditure in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 212), as now or hereafter amended and supplemented.

23 USC 1 note.

68 Stat. 76.

68 Stat. 77.

(b) By virtue of the design and plan of said highway in relation to the three sections of Federal-Aid Primary Route Numbered 1 included in Federal-aid projects UI-29, UI-64, and FI-145, which permit unrestricted use of said sections without payment of tolls, it is hereby declared that the incorporation of said sections into said highway will not violate any provision of said Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, or any regulation thereunder. If at any time the highway commissioner of the State of Connecticut shall determine to impose tolls upon or for the use of any one or more of said sections, all Federal-aid road funds theretofore paid or programed for expenditure on such section or sections upon which tolls are to be imposed, shall be transferred for programing and expenditure in cooperation with the Connecticut State Highway Department pursuant to the provisions of said Federal Highway Act, as now or hereafter amended and supplemented. At the time of such transfer, the project agreement with respect to the project for which the funds are transferred shall be canceled. Upon such cancellation, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to credit the Federal pro rata share of such project agreement to the unprogramed balance of Federal-aid road funds of the same class last apportioned to the State of Connecticut. The amount so credited shall be in addition to all other funds then apportioned to said State and shall be available for expenditure in accordance with the provisions of said Federal Highway Act, as now or hereafter amended and supplemented. In lieu of the transfer thereof, the highway commissioner of the State of Connecticut may repay the Federal-aid road funds paid on any such section in the same manner and with the same effect as is provided with respect to the repayment of Federal-aid road funds in subsection (a) of this section.

(c) Upon the repayment or transfer of Federal-aid road funds, as hereinbefore provided, any such section or sections included in the project with respect to which such repayment or transfer is made, shall become and be free from any and all restrictions contained in said Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, or any regulation thereunder, with respect to the imposition and collection of tolls or other charges thereon or for the use thereof.

SEC. 23. This Act may be cited as the "Federal-Aid Highway Act Short title. of 1954".

Approved May 6, 1954.

